Author:
[No Value], Jennifer Man Ching Law

Title:
Internationalization of higher education in Hong Kong - An investigation into the implementation of internationalization strategies for undergraduate programs in a local university

University of BRISTOL

Internationalization of Higher Education in Hong Kong – An Investigation into the Implementation of Internationalization Strategies For Undergraduate Programs in a Local University

Jennifer Man Ching LAW

A dissertation submitted to the University of Bristol
In accordance with the requirements of
The degree of Doctor of Education,
In the Faculty of Social Sciences and Law
And the Graduate School of Education

Submitted: November 2012

Abstract

The term "internationalization of higher education" in Hong Kong, usually calls to mind the number or percentage of "non-local" students studying in universities and institutions. With the HKSAR Government's initiatives of turning Hong Kong into a "regional education hub" and the relaxation of "non-local" student quota of up to 20% of the annual undergraduate intake since 2007, local higher education institutions need to work even harder in formulating strategies for internationalization. Statistically, the number of "non-local" as well as exchange students has been on a rising trend year after year; however, not much research has been conducted on the key stakeholders' (students, faculty members and administrators) perspectives, attitudes, and perhaps, struggles and difficulties, when they are faced with the implementation of internationalization strategies in the day-to-day campus / classroom / working environment.

This qualitative study was conducted at a local university with a focus on undergraduate programs. Undergraduate students, faculty members and administrators from the local context and outside Hong Kong were interviewed to find out how they defined "internationalization of higher education", evaluated the effectiveness of related strategies, as well as how the strategies have influenced their role in learning, teaching, and administration. By analyzing findings from interviews and reviewing relevant literature from Hong Kong, U.K., U.S. and Australia, this study investigates the implementation of internationalization strategies at a local university, with an aim to find out whether there is any "missing link" between "ideals" formulated by decision makers and "realities" faced by key stakeholders. Central themes emerging from the findings contribute to further studies in this field and serve as a reflection for decision makers in future strategies formulation and/or evaluation.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to thank my family for their love, care, and support throughout the years – My dad, for being my best critic; my mom, for "being there" and feeding me with (more than enough) comfort food; and my sister (Vanessa), for the fun and laughter we shared, when I had to (temporarily) get away from my dissertation.

Next, I would like to thank my supervisor, Dr Sheila Trahar, for her guidance in the past two years, and her positive reinforcement that studying for a doctoral degree while working full-time is something that can be done – She has set an excellent example herself! I am grateful for her patience in going through draft after draft of my dissertation chapters, her care in giving me detailed and valuable notes, comments and suggestions, and her constant motivation to me.

I would also like to thank all Unit Tutors of Cohort 11, and especially our Cohort Coordinator, Professor Michael Crossley, who has introduced to me and my classmates five years ago, in a clear and interesting way, how educational research is done in different paradigms. The Unit Tutors have given me lots of inspiration at the early stages when I was contemplating my own research study, as well as useful feedback to my assignments.

The staff at both the Postgraduate Programme Office at Bristol and the SCOPE Office at CityU have been most helpful and supportive, and I really appreciate the efforts by SCOPE in the annual Doctoral Student Seminar, which provided a good channel for networking with other EdD students as well as scholars in the field.

Last, but certainly not least, I would like to thank all students, faculty members and administrators for their time and willingness to participate in the interview (both the pilot & actual ones) for my research study. Without your valuable input, candid observations and experiences sharing, I would not have been able to complete my research so smoothly. I am indebted to the support of a colleague (who happens to be one of the interviewees for my pilot study, so he must remain anonymous); without his encouragement, I would not have pursued a doctoral degree in the first place. I wish him all the best, as he is now working hard in completing his doctoral studies.

Declaration page not scanned
at the request of the
University

Table of Contents

List of Tables & Appendices

Chapter 1 – Introduction, Rationale and Aim of Study

i. Background of the Study

Hong Kong has long been a place where "East meets West", with a unique combination of traditional Chinese heritage from its humble beginnings, and Western influence from its colonial years. It is also one of the most popular tourist spots in Southeast Asia, with millions of visitors coming to Hong Kong each year. However, it was only in the last decade, that the Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (HKSAR) began exploring the possibility of transforming Hong Kong into a "regional education hub" (HKSAR 2007:1). HKSAR's education hub policy has several aims: 1. To attract quality non-local students to study in Hong Kong; 2. To further internationalize the higher education sector and increase the exposure of local students; 3. To attract and retain non-local talents to live and work in Hong Kong; and 4. To enhance the overall competitiveness of Hong Kong's economy in the long run (Ibid: 3).

In order to achieve the first two aims, the HKSAR Government approved, in 2007, the increasing of non-local annual undergraduate intake to a maximum of 20% (UGC 2010: 53-54). In Hong Kong, the term "non-local students" is defined as "persons entering Hong Kong for the purpose of education, with a student visa or entry permit issued by the Immigration Department of the HKSAR Government" (http://www.immd.gov.hk/ehtml/hkvisas_1.htm#intro). Since Mainland Chinese students are also required by the Immigration Department to obtain a valid visa for entry to Hong Kong for the purpose of education, they are included in the "non-local students" category and the calculation of the 20% annual intake quota. In this study,

when the term "non-local students" is used, further details will be provided on whether these "non-local students" came from Mainland China, or from outside of *both* Hong Kong and Mainland China (i.e. "international").

In response to the Government's new initiatives, universities in Hong Kong needed to come up with new strategies for internationalization, especially in the area of recruiting talents from both Mainland China and around the world to study in their undergraduate degree programs. The focus of this qualitative study is on the University where I am currently employed as an administrator, and the pseudonym *KDU* will be used for the purpose of protecting the identity of the University.

I have been working as a member of the administrative staff at *KDU* since 2005, and during the past seven years, I have been involved in various university initiatives for the promotion of internationalization on campus. From my interactions with local, Mainland Chinese and international students, I found that they were indeed "different" from each other, and I kept hearing about academic and adjustment difficulties of our non-local students. In addition, I heard stories about non-local international students' dissatisfaction with the "local" curriculum in their first year of study, especially subjects in mathematics and science; no matter how hard-working they were, they could never "make the grade" as easily as those from Hong Kong or Mainland China. Moreover, local students also complained, most of the time in discussion forums, that they have been "disadvantaged" in terms of "getting good grades" or "getting hall spaces" by the influx of non-local students both from Mainland China and other countries. These "stories" have sparked my interest in knowing more about how "internationalization" is viewed in the eyes of students, and whether our faculty members and administrators were aware of the implications of

internationalization strategies on teaching, learning in class and to students' life on campus.

Apart from my first-hand experience of working and interacting with students from different backgrounds, I am also aware, through reviewing major reports on education trends, such as OECD's *Education at a Glance*, that internationalization in the higher education sector is part of a global movement that, so far, involves only a small number of "receiving countries". Over the past thirty years, the number of students enrolled outside their country of citizenship has risen over five times, from 0.8 million in 1975 to 4.1 million in 2010 (OECD 2012: 362), and in 2010, almost one out of two "foreign" students was enrolled in five "major host countries", U.S., U.K., Australia, Germany and France (Ibid: 363). However, in terms of "sending countries", 51% of total "international" students enrolled in OECD countries (and 55% in non-OECD countries) came from Asia (Ibid: 369). *(Note: According to OECD's definition, "foreign students" are those who do not have citizenship of the country where they are enrolled, but may be long-term residents or have been born there, while "international students" refer to those who have moved from their country of origin with the purpose of studying.)*

Among "international" students originating from non-member countries, students from China represented by far the largest group, with 19% of all "international" students enrolled in OECD countries; in absolute terms, the largest numbers came from China, India and Korea (OECD 2012: 360, 369-370). Against this background of dominance by Mainland Chinese as well as Asian students studying outside their country of origin, the complexities of the postcolonial context of Hong Kong, and its relationship with Mainland China after the return of sovereignty in 1997,

it would be interesting to find out from this study, whether internationalization of higher education in Hong Kong has followed a similar development, or if there is any uniqueness to the Hong Kong context.

As for the research approach, my impression was that, within the University, surveys on students, whether they are related to teaching and learning or satisfaction and engagement, were conducted mostly in the form of large-scale questionnaires, with findings mainly focused on the numbers and percentages. Moreover, after talking with colleagues from academic support units on some work-related matters concerning student surveys, I found that the University has not engaged in any surveys or studies on the perspectives of faculty members (and administrators) towards the learning attitudes of students from different backgrounds in their classes. From what I learned in my EdD studies, without "triangulation of data", which means combining different ways of looking at the same issue (Silverman 2005: 177), it would be difficult to draw a full picture, or "realities", of experiences by all those involved in day-to-day teaching, learning and operational environment. Therefore, I believe that my study, which has drawn references from literature on internationalization of higher education in Hong Kong, U.K., U.S., and Australia, as well as engaging in the analysis of qualitative data collected directly from key stakeholders (undergraduates, faculty members and administrators) who were experiencing internationalization first-hand in *KDU*, will contribute findings that further reflect the "realities" into the field of internationalization of higher education in Hong Kong.

In order to carry out this study, firstly, a set of research questions to be addressed by the study was formulated. Then, a review was conducted of literature

related to internationalization in both local and international contexts, as well as specific case studies from Hong Kong, as well as U.K., U.S and Australia. I focused on studies in higher education institutions from these places (U.K., U.S., and Australia), because they were involved in internationalization long before Hong Kong first started its internationalization initiatives, and they have also been "major receiving countries" of international students according to OECD (2012: 363). Reviewing relevant literature from these places revealed whether institutions in the Hong Kong context have (or have not) been faced with similar issues, problems or conflicts arising from internationalization strategies.

After that, a research methodology was identified to ensure the data collection and analysis process would generate meaningful findings for the study. Interviews with students, faculty members and administrators of *KDU* were coded, and findings analyzed on their evaluation of the effectiveness of the internationalization strategies' implementation and the implications of strategies on these major stakeholders in learning, teaching and administration. As an administrator working at *KDU*, I also added my own observations and experiences in the discussion.

The rest of this chapter will go into more detail about the rationale of this research study, lay out the research questions to be addressed, and give a brief outline of the content of each chapter and its role in the dissertation.

ii. Rationale for and Aim of the Study

In the two decades since its establishment, *KDU* has become one of the world's premier research universities in the fields of science, business, engineering, and social sciences. In recent years, *KDU* has achieved world-wide recognition in research and teaching, and has been ranked among the top universities in global "league tables". To further capitalize on *KDU*'s competitive edge and to augment the HKSAR Government's strategies for internationalization, *KDU* has developed a 15-year strategic plan (2005-2020), which includes strategies related to internationalization. In 2011, an updated five-year strategic plan (2011-2016) was developed to reaffirm its vision as a leading university with significant international impact and strong local commitment (*KDU* 2011c: 1).

With the Government's new initiatives in place, higher education institutions in Hong Kong are moving towards internationalization, with an aim to increase the quota for non-local undergraduate students in phases and eventually reaching the target of 20% of total annual intake. However, formulation of new strategies is merely the first step towards internationalization of higher education. It is important that the strategies are implemented effectively in order to maximize the benefits for the stakeholders concerned. However, very often, implementation is the most crucial yet difficult aspect in ensuring the success of new strategies. No matter how "ideal" a strategy may be, if it is not implemented properly in reality, it constitutes little more than an academic exercise.

The aim of the study is to compare the "ideals" and "realities" of internationalization of higher education in Hong Kong, using a case of the implementation of the strategies at *KDU*. During the strategies' formulation process, many ideals were created; unfortunately, very often these ideals have not been achieved due to the realities of feasibility, management, or even opposing forces from key stakeholders. The significance of the study is in finding out whether there is any "missing link" in implementation, as well as to evaluate the effectiveness of the internationalization strategies at *KDU* from the perspectives of key stakeholders.

Furthermore, analysis from the study will serve as a reflection for decision makers and key stakeholders from *KDU* on the current situation and towards the enhancement of efforts in internationalization strategies implementation. Also, the study may be useful to other local institutions as a reference in carrying out similar research within their own institution to evaluate the effectiveness of their internationalization strategies implementation.

iii. Research Questions

Four major research questions are addressed in the study:

1. *Are there any differences in the definition of "internationalization of higher education" in the global and local context, and how does the local definition play a role in the formulation and implementation of the internationalization strategy in KDU?*

2. *Who are the decision makers and administrators in formulating internationalization strategies in KDU, and what are their observations and evaluations of the effectiveness of the strategies' implementation?*

3. *How do other key stakeholders (including local and non-local undergraduates and faculty members) define internationalization, and how do they "feel" (including perspectives, attitudes and interpretations) about the effectiveness of strategies implementation?*

4. *Based on the data collected and analyzed for Questions 2 & 3, is there any "missing link" between the "ideals" formulated by the decision makers and "realities" faced by key stakeholders in internationalization strategies implementation in KDU? If so, what could be done to "bridge the link"?*

A qualitative methodological approach was used and data gathered from key stakeholders (local/non-local undergraduates, faculty members and administrators) were coded and analyzed, and findings from the analysis were used to address the research questions.

iv. Outline of Chapters in the Dissertation

Lastly, the following is a brief outline of each chapter in the dissertation:

Chapter 2 is a literature review on internationalization of higher education in both local and international contexts, and relevant case studies in Hong Kong, U.K., U.S. and Australia. How the term (internationalization of higher education) is defined and critiqued internationally and locally, as well as its close relationship with the "Internationalization at Home" concept, are discussed. Literature is presented and reviewed in detail, which will provide part of the answer for the first Research Question in the study.

Chapter 3 focuses on the research methodology of this study. Firstly, paradigms in social science research are described, including positivist and interpretivist paradigms, followed by justifications for placing this study within the interpretivist paradigm. Then, strengths and limitations of the philosophical perspective and the methodology are discussed. The research approach of this study, including sources of data, collection of data (by interviews), and coding of data gathered from interview transcripts are illustrated in detail, and the chapter closes with a discussion of possible ethical issues arising from the interviews and from myself being both a researcher of the study and a staff member of the University.

Chapter 4 presents the findings from five student interviews conducted in this study. Students from different backgrounds, including local students educated in conventional secondary school and international school, non-local students from Mainland China and abroad, were interviewed. Their views on the definition of internationalization, the level of internationalization at *KDU*, as well as their relationship with other local/non-local students and faculty members, observations/experience of teaching and learning in an international classroom, and evaluation of what makes students "happy" about life in university are analyzed in light of relevant literature. The background of students and their experience from secondary education have influenced how they perceive themselves in the internationalized university setting. Findings also reveal local students' struggles in being a "good host" to non-local students in their home university.

Chapter 5 discusses findings from five faculty interviews, with an aim to find out more on the somewhat "overlooked" perspectives from faculty members on the implementation of internationalization strategies at *KDU*. The faculty members,

from the local context or abroad, were either educated in the U.S. or have teaching experiences in international classrooms. They were asked to define the term "internationalization of higher education" and to give their observations on the level of internationalization at the University. Through their observations, teaching experience and personal interactions with local and non-local students, a number of faculty members raised concerns about internationalization of higher education in Hong Kong, such as its elision with "Westernization", the policy of including "Mainland Chinese students" in the category of "non-local students", and local students' ability and motivation to interact with those from outside Hong Kong.

Chapter 6 is the last of the three data analysis chapters and focuses on data gathered from interviews with five administrators. Through a triangulation of perspectives from these three groups of key stakeholders, it is apparent that administrators hold a different view from students and faculty members on internationalization of higher education and its related strategies. Administrators evaluate the current situation with an emphasis on figures, statistics and facts. They make similar observations on issues of student integration and struggles of both local and non-local students within the context of internationalization. Those who do not have previous teaching experience are less knowledgeable about teaching strategies. It is also reflected from the findings, that administrators did not see themselves as "actors in the play" in the internationalization process, and more work needs to be done on "educating the staff" to be sensitive about the needs of students from different backgrounds.

Chapter 7 summarizes the data analysis chapters, and discusses how the findings address the four research questions of this study. Central themes that emerged from the findings are presented, themes that may serve as reflections for decision makers and management in the field of internationalization of higher education in Hong Kong and *KDU*. The strengths and limitations of this study, particularly, the methodological approach, are reviewed, and how this study may contribute to the current literature of internationalization of higher education in Hong Kong is also discussed. At the end, I conclude the chapter with suggestions on future research, and reflect on what I have learned as a researcher, while being a member of staff at *KDU* and a student enrolled in a transnational doctoral program offered in Hong Kong.

(Blank page)

Chapter 2 – Internationalization of Higher Education – Literature Review

i. Introduction

This chapter is a review of literature in the areas related to internationalization of higher education. First is an overview of the history of internationalization of higher education developments, followed by definitions of internationalization in both international and local contexts. Literature on the concept of "Internationalization at Home", which is closely related to internationalization of higher education, is also reviewed, as well as critiques by researchers on the recent developments of internationalization. Case studies from Hong Kong, U.K., U.S. and Australia related to key stakeholders' attitudes towards internationalization in their university are reviewed, in order to compare the situations, issues and/or feelings that emerged from data collected from the interviews conducted in my study, and to identify any significant differences in stakeholders' encounters unique to Hong Kong's local context.

ii. History of Internationalization of Higher Education Developments

The research on internationalization in higher education first started in the mid-1990s. Knight and de Wit were among the first scholars who started doing research in this area. In their study in 1995, Knight & de Wit illustrated in detail the developments of internationalization of higher education since the Middle Ages to present time (Knight & de Wit 1995: 6-9) from a European perspective.

According to Knight & de Wit, there were three stages in the history of higher education: universities in the Middle Ages and Renaissance; the nationalist

period (between 1800 & WWII); and post-war period up to the present day. Most publications on present day internationalization of higher education in Europe made reference to the days of the Middle Ages and Renaissance up to the end of the 17th century, with plenty of examples of student/scholar mobility (pilgrimage). "Erasmus", one of the best-known wandering scholars of that period, was the name chosen by the European Commission for their most important mobility program. It is reflected throughout history, that the concept of "internationalization" has been considered mainly, though not exclusively, from a "Western" perspective.

The most important element of internationalization between 18th century and WWII was the export of systems of higher education. From colonial powers to their colonies came the model of higher education; even the US system was based on European influences back then and remained so for a long time. Secondly, the area of research and publications, in particular the international exchange of ideas and information through seminars, conferences and publications, played an important role in the need for internationalization of higher education. Thirdly, student mobility has made some of the internationally renowned universities became centers for international learning.

The creation of the IIE (Institute of International Education) in 1919 and the British Council in 1934 were indicators of the growing interest in international cooperation and exchange. After WWII, two new superpowers, US and Soviet Union, emerged. Migration of academics from European countries to US, Canada and Australia made these countries "centers" for international education. At the same time, the Soviet Union also engaged in international cooperation and exchange with Third World countries and other befriended nations. Also, during the 1950s to 1980s, large

development funds moved into Asia, Latin America and Africa, with student flows from South to North and faculty and funds from North to South.

The end of the Cold War and collapse of many communist countries in Europe from the late 1980s to early 1990s caused a power shift from the U.S. and Soviet Union to new emerging powers in Asia (China, Japan, South Korea) and Europe (the European Union). The promotion of international cooperation and exchange has now added economic, political and cultural dimensions. At the present time, the "information age" is a restoration of universal standards in science and education, and it has also sparked the development of internationalization strategies of higher education institutions around the world.

Based on the history of the internationalization in higher education, a preliminary definition of "internationalization" emerged. "Internationalization" can be defined as ways that countries, institutions and individuals choose to cope with the increasingly globalized academic environment. Other possible definitions and the motives behind internationalization are further discussed in the next section.

iii. Definition of Internationalization of Higher Education

The "definition" of internationalization, according to de Wit, has been "confusing" from the start. He suggests that there is no standard definition of internationalization, as it is commonly accepted that "internationalization of the curriculum" has the same meaning as "internationalization" (Elkin, Devjee, & Farnsworth 2005: 321). In 1997, Knight and de Wit proposed a possible working definition of internationalization, which is **"the process of integrating an**

international perspective into the teaching/learning, research and services of a higher education institution" (Taylor 2004: 150), and the OECD also came up with a similar definition in 1999. Knight and de Wit (1995: 25-28) also argued that internationalization and its related strategy can be regarded as a "cyclical" development which includes six stages: awareness, commitment, planning, operationalizing, review and reinforcement. In the 1990s, there had also been other definitions of internationalization proposed by various institutions; Knight & de Wit have summarized a few of the more comprehensive ones (1995: 15-16):

- *EAIE's* (European Association for International Education) "internationalization being the whole range of processes by which education becomes less national and more internationally oriented";

- *AUCC's* (Association of Universities and Colleges in Canada) "It is a multitude of activities aimed at providing an educational experience within an environment that truly integrates a global perspective";

- *British Columbia Council on International Education Task Force's* "internationalization is a process that prepares the community for successful participation in an increasingly interdependent world...The process should infuse all facets of the post-secondary education system, fostering global understanding and developing skills for effective living and working in a diverse world".

In 2004, Knight published another article to re-examine and update the conceptual frameworks underpinning the notion of internationalization in light of the changes and challenges in the world of higher education. Knight re-visits the definition of internationalization to ensure that the meaning reflects the realities and is able to guide and be relevant to new developments. The updated working definition is as follows: **"The process of integrating an international, intercultural or global**

dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education" (Knight 2004: 11-12). This definition does not conflict with the previous one, as the new working definition attempts to address the realities of today's context, where the national (i.e. "global dimension") / sector (i.e. "post-secondary education") level is extremely important, and therefore must be covered in a definition.

At the end of the article, Knight also raises two interesting questions about the future development of internationalization of higher education. Firstly, given the complexity involved in working in the field of internationalization, Knight asks how are the competencies (e.g. a set of knowledge, attitudes, skills and understandings about the international/intercultural/global dimension of higher education) defined, developed and recognized for academics, administrators, and policymakers. Then, Knight also asks, in the year of 2020, what would be considered as the major accomplishments of internationalization during the past 30 years, and what would be the long-term implications and consequence of internationalization? (Ibid: 29-30) I think these two questions raised by Knight are still valid today, and even though many countries have come a long way towards internationalizing their higher education institutions, more work needs to be done on the "ground level" by people who feel that they are competent (and appropriate) to implement internationalization policies and strategies.

In their book published in 2008 on *Internationalizing the University*, Turner and Robson (2008: 20) also raised a concern about "reciprocal internationalization"– the importance for universities to develop within an internationally-integrated environment, rather than as national universities which accommodate the needs of people from other countries into their pre-existing

practices (2008: 20). They suggested a notion, similar to Knight's, that university staff (teaching and administrative) need to have intercultural competences to cope with growing challenges in multicultural teaching and learning environments (Ibid: 70). Their views and questions about internationalization would help interpret the findings related to stakeholders' observations and evaluations of the effectiveness of strategy implementation in my study.

Apart from the "textbook definitions" as illustrated above, in reality, definitions of internationalization are very often not as clear-cut as those that are academically defined. In a study by Hyland, Trahar, Anderson and Dickens published in 2008 on the internationalization experiences of staff and students in UK higher education, the terms "internationalization" and "internationalization of the curriculum" were described in many ways by staff and students. Although the importance of integrating internationalization at all activity levels within a university is recognized by many, some still questioned the use of these terms, and expressed difficulties in developing a truly internationalized curriculum. As many teaching programs in the UK are accredited by professional organizations, teaching staff found it difficult to consider a truly "internationalized" curriculum due to restrictions imposed by the accrediting organizations (Hyland et al. 2008: 15). I believe that restrictions like these often create "hurdles" for people working at the "ground level", and no matter how thoroughly internationalization of higher education is defined, it would always be a challenge to implement it in reality.

iv. Definition of Internationalization of Higher Education – Local Context

In this section, the definition of "internationalization of higher education" within the local context is compared with international definitions to determine whether there are any differences between "local" and "Western" perspectives. According to research by Rui Yang on the connection between Mainland China and Hong Kong in the internationalization of Chinese universities, Yang argues that Hong Kong is by nature an international community and has always been outward looking; therefore, the internationalization of higher education in Hong Kong carries another "mission" of bringing first class scholars and their academic work to universities in Mainland China (Yang 2003: 129). Since the return of Hong Kong's sovereignty to Mainland China in 1997, this "mission" has become even more prominent, with new government policy allowing Mainland high school graduates to study in undergraduate programs offered by universities in Hong Kong from 1999 onwards. This notion is further exemplified by a report published in 2004 by the University Grants Committee (UGC), a non-statutory advisory committee responsible for advising the HKSAR Government on the funding of eight local higher education institutions, including *KDU*. In the report, entitled *Hong Kong Higher Education – To Make a Difference; to Move with the Times*, it explicitly mentioned that "Hong Kong can and should play a facilitating role in linking the Mainland and the world at large" (UGC 2004: 4). In terms of attracting non-local students to Hong Kong, at that time, UGC "foresee a significant increase in the non-local student population, a large proportion of whom will come from the Mainland. Our higher education sector, which is internationalized, will provide Mainland students with a valuable international perspective." (Ibid: 5).

Interestingly, in 1998, Yang conducted a field study in 17 institutions of higher learning in Guangzhou, China. 47.46% of a total of 59 administrators surveyed did not know what "international perspective" meant (a key concept of Knight's well-known definition of internationalization). There has been a long-standing argument between one-sided adaptation and the issue of Chinese national character since the early 1990s, when China decided to adopt a market economy, and the notion of *Jiegui* (a Chinese term meaning "to connect tracks", often used in the context of the discussion on China's need to be "connected" to the globalized economy and on par with "Western" standards in various aspects, including its education system) first came about among higher education institutions in China (Yang 2002: 84).

Yang argues that the rationale for internationalization of higher education lies in an understanding of the universal nature of the advancement of knowledge. Universities are by nature committed to advancing human knowledge, so they are necessarily engaged in international cooperation. However, in recent years, internationalization has been regarded more as a beneficial tool for economic and political policies. There needs to be a burst of creativity and renewed energy to re-imagine the university as an intellectual community and as a locus of intellectual life that is responsive to the changed political, social and economic conditions in the globalized world (Ibid: 86-88). Yang's argument here raises a point that Chinese universities should not only consider their political and/or economic agenda of *Jiegui*, but should also devote efforts in creating intellectual communities that are truly internationalized and committed to knowledge advancement.

In a presentation at the University of Bristol Hong Kong Doctoral Seminar held in March 2012, Yang presented key issues in educational research in

Confucian heritage cultures. According to Yang, since "the West" came to China with "enormous prestige", Chinese educational traditions have never been packaged coherently in light of Westernization, and few scholars can articulate clearly the relevance of China's classical education values. The Chinese and Western educational heritages are regarded as two "isolated bodies of literature", and the links between the two discourses are "entirely lacking". Yang proposes that the central purpose of modern education in China is to bring together aspects of the Chinese and Western philosophical heritage, but unfortunately this has yet been achieved *(Excerpts from powerpoint presentation by Rui Yang at SCOPE, City University of Hong Kong, on 24 March 2012.)* I believe, based on Yang's arguments, that there have been cases of "direct borrowing from the West" in Hong Kong's internationalization of higher education policies, with the most prominent one being the creation of a "regional education hub" advocated by the HKSAR Government.

In a recent study by Knight (2011), she re-visits the development of regional education hubs in six places including Hong Kong. She questions that given higher education's current preoccupation with competitiveness, branding and rankings, one is not sure whether a country's plan to develop itself as an "education hub" is a fad, the latest branding strategy, or in fact, an innovation worthy of investment and serious attention (221). Her evaluation of HKSAR Government's "regional education hub" policy is that the major aim is to attract international students for study and work (Ibid: 228). The admission quota for non-local undergraduates has increased, more scholarships are available, and the immigration policies have been relaxed for non-local graduates to work in Hong Kong. However, as students from Mainland China are also included as "non-locals", Knight casts doubts on whether Hong Kong is serving as a "regional education hub" or as "a gateway or bridge for students from

the Mainland" instead (Ibid: 229). I think Knight's questions raise an important issue that "borrowing" Western practices without taking into account the local context will only serve the "means" rather than the "ends" of internationalization of higher education. This argument will be further elaborated in *Section vi*, under Mok's critique of the internationalization process in Asian universities.

In a book chapter by Ziguras & McBurnie in 2011, they also investigated the rapid development of international student mobility in the Asia-Pacific, especially the growth in mobility of Mainland Chinese students. For instance, in 2007, there were over 400,000 mainland Chinese students studying outside China, which is equal to 0.4% of the country's tertiary age population (2011: 127), with receiving countries still dominated by North America and Europe. Moreover, countries in East Asia and the Pacific have been increasingly attractive to students from South and West Asia, which has created more intra-regional student mobility (Ibid: 128).

This trend is similar to the observation by Knight, that student mobility in the Asia-Pacific has become more "intra-regional", and dominance by "students from the Mainland" has not been the only case in Hong Kong, but also within the region. However, Ziguras & McBurnie used the *Aesop Fable* of "the goose that laid the golden eggs" as a warning sign when they comment on the success of Australian and New Zealand universities in attracting international students. More often than before, the recruitment of international students has been regarded as a "business activity", with students treated as "clients" or "consumers" (Ibid: 132). The overemphasis on the pursuit of revenue at the expense of traditional education values may undermine the quality of education, and they fear that this would tarnish the national brand and deter "high-quality" students from studying in Australia (Ibid: 133, 139).

Another argument along this line is raised by Zha, that in many countries and settings, internationalization is rather seen as a "means" to achieve a wider goal, but Zha argues that the "means" can lead to positive effects, such as quality improvement, restructuring, and upgrading of higher education systems and services (2003: 250). Therefore, Zha supports the inclusion of "any systematic, sustained efforts aimed at making higher education responsive to the requirements and challenges related to the globalization of societies, economy and labor markets" into the definition of internationalization (Ibid). To some extent, I think both Ziguras & McBurnie's and Zha's argument reflect the "reality" of internationalization strategies of higher education institutions in Hong Kong; on the one hand, it is a "means" rather than an "aim"; on the other hand, internationalization can also be an incentive for "the pursuit of revenue".

A good example of the above-mentioned "reality" is that the increase of non-local student numbers generates additional income. The eight publicly-funded institutions under the UGC, including *KDU*, receive triennial funding based on "approved student number target", and the total of publicly funded "first-year-first-degree" places in all eight institutions has been set at 14,500 since the 1994/95 academic year (UGC 1993: 3). Therefore, the 20% annual non-local undergraduate intake translated into nearly 3,000 places for non-local students. However, according to UGC's policy, only 4% of the non-local student intake was allowed to be subsidized by public funds (known as the "4%-in-quota"). That means local students still took up 96% of the 14,500 "first-year-first-degree" places, while non-local students would need to bear the "marginal cost" incurred by the institutions for providing additional places to them. In a meeting of the Panel of Education of the Hong Kong Legislative Council in 2005, it was discussed that the estimated "marginal

cost" of an additional place on top of the publicly-funded 14,500 places was at least HK$60,000/year (HKSAR 2005: 7). However, as of the current academic year (2012/13), non-local students are paying more than double the local fees at *KDU* (HK$100,000/year for non-locals versus HK$42,100/year for locals). Even though there seemed to be a significant rise in non-local tuition fees since 2005, according to the administrators I have interviewed (*ADMIN060 & ADMIN150*), this was still considered reasonable to parents, when compared to how much they would need to spend on their children for tuition fees, housing and living expenses for undergraduate degree programs in North America, Europe or Australia. Tuition fees collected from non-local students have generated a considerable sum of additional income, which was used to fund campus development projects, student enrichment programs, internationalization activities, as well as promotional trips/activities for non-local student recruitment. This has also been a good "incentive" for higher education institutions to support internationalization initiatives.

The implications of the above definitions and strategies in the local context to the formulation and implementation of internationalization strategies in *KDU* will be further investigated in my study.

v. *"Internationalization at Home"*

Another concept which relates to internationalization is "Internationalization at Home" (IaH), which was first raised by a group of European scholars in 1999. It focuses on giving the "non-mobile" students a better understanding of people from different countries and cultures in a globalized world (Crowther et al. 2000: 12). According to Otten (Ibid: 16), the major players in IaH are

international students, local students and local faculty and staff. IaH aims at facilitating an increasingly intercultural academic climate at the host institution, and maximizing the benefits from internationalization for domestic students. Also, faculty members teaching in an intercultural environment should be sensitive to different cultural styles of learning and teaching.

IaH also involves internationalizing the curriculum. Nilsson (Ibid: 22) defines an internationalized curriculum as "a curriculum which gives international and intercultural knowledge and abilities, aimed at preparing students for performing (professionally, socially, emotionally) in an international and multicultural context." It is important that institutions provide both courses which give students good knowledge about international relations and foreign cultures and make them motivated to work with people from different cultural background.

Five years after the concept of IaH was first introduced, NUFFIC organized an international conference in Rotterdam to re-visit the concept of "Internationalization at Home". At that time, Teekens reflected that the issue of curriculum development in IaH concerns both content and delivery, with the goal of creating a new context for teaching and learning in the classroom (2006:6). However, practitioners in the field of internationalization often give little priority to reflection. Teekens argues that flexibility and creativity among teaching faculty are important to see their own role, scope and limitations more clearly and to see beyond the practicalities of day-to-day problem-solving (Ibid: 9).

In 2010, a review of the 3rd Global Survey Report of the International Association of Universities (IAU) was published. The Global Survey involves two

categories of respondents – Higher Education Institutions and National Rectors' Conference or University Associations, from six different regions: Africa, Asia & Pacific, Europe, Latin America and Caribbean, with a majority of respondents from Europe. Beelen provides the results of four questions that mentioned IaH and internationalization of the curriculum, and a fifth question related to internal obstacles to the internationalization process (2011: 253).

The result of the survey confirms the relevance of internationalization of the curriculum as one of the two "pillars" of internationalization. Also, many higher education institutions see internationalization as beneficial to students for preparing them as workers in a globalized world. However, at the same time, the survey reveals major obstacles in IaH, including lack of involvement of academic staff, limited expertise and/or lack of foreign language proficiency. Beelen argues that it is necessary to link the obstacles to a number of underlying issues, such as the skills required to develop an international curriculum, general foreign language proficiency, and skills for teaching in a second language and/or teaching learners who use their second language (Ibid: 261-262). Similar issues were raised by faculty members in their interviews, as many of the local faculty members are teaching in their second language (English), and teaching students who use English as their second language.

In her book published in 2011, Trahar has touched on the concept of IaH, from a local student's perspective on developing cultural capability. "Local" students in the U.K., are defined as those who were either born and/or educated in the U.K. and who are studying and working in a familiar context (Trahar 2011: 80). Trahar argues that many existing studies have assumed homogeneity among the "home" and "international" student population, and she proposes that the identity of "local"

students in the U.K. context is actually very diverse, with "local" ethnic minorities sometimes being singled out as "different" (Ibid: 81). Therefore, if "home" students are to develop intercultural capabilities, they will need to develop mindfulness and challenge the "taboos" surrounding the "differences" (Ibid: 90). A purpose of my study was to compare the "localness" among students in the Hong Kong context to find out whether they perceive themselves as a "homogeneous" or "diverse" group, and whether they are aware of the benefits brought on by the implementation of internationalization strategies such as IaH in the University.

vi. Critiques of Internationalization of Higher Education

One of the critiques surrounding internationalization of higher education is its interchangeable use with "globalization". According to Altbach & Knight (2007: 290), globalization is the economic, political, and societal forces pushing 21st century higher education toward greater international involvement, with investment of global capital into knowledge industries worldwide. This investment reflects the emergence of the "knowledge society", the rise of the service sector and the dependence of many societies on knowledge products and highly educated personnel for economic growth.

While "internationalization of higher education" involves an integration of international dimensions into education according to the definition by Knight and de Wit, "globalization" sees international higher education as a commodity to be freely traded and sees higher education as a private good, not a public responsibility. For example, the WTO (World Trade Organization) provides a regulatory framework to encourage international trade in education and service-related industries as part of negotiating the GATS (General Agreement on Trade in Services). It focuses on

facilitating academic mobility via cross-border supply, consumption abroad, commercial presence; and presence of natural persons (Ibid: 292).

Personally, I feel that one must be careful in using the terms "internationalization" and "globalization" interchangeably. Even though they may look similar, they actually carry very different underlying meanings. For instance, I do not agree that successful "internationalization" means successful "commercialization" of education programs to overseas students. Commercialization of higher education may bring significant economic benefits to countries/institutions, but key stakeholders (students and faculty) may not be enjoying these benefits at the same time, or may even be "suffering" in some way. An article by Jiang (2008) provides a reflection on internationalization of higher education under the influence of globalization, and questions the existing models facilitated by GATS on the commercialization and commodification of higher education.

Jiang (2008: 348) argues that today's internationalization of higher education has shifted to narrower economic objectives. The GATS (General Agreement on Trade in Services) has "legitimized" the commercialization and commodification of higher education, and now higher education institutions focus highly on generating extra income from exporting education and attracting international students to their institutions. However, internationalization not only occurs beyond, but also *within* national borders, such as the case for IaH. To serve profit-seeking purpose, distinction between "knowledge" and "information" has been blurred. "Knowledge" on the one hand, involves deeper understanding and reasonable judgment, and needs to be transmitted to people in some systematic form; "information", on the other hand, relates to the storage, retrieval and processing of

data (Ibid).

Jiang also critiques the internationalization of higher education, as most of the voices arguing for internationalization are Western, particularly the voice of the OECD supported by the WTO (Ibid: 352-353). Developing countries are deprived of the right to have a say about curriculum, quality standards and many other educational elements. It is also problematic to treat higher education as a "service" or "commodity", as it is a vital part of culture and society and should not simply be standardized according to the "Western" system (e.g. WTO & GATS). Researchers should not disregard the impact of immigrant students in many countries with multicultural societies, such as UK and US, on the internationalization of higher education (Ibid: 355-356).

Personally, I agree with Jiang that higher education institutions should reflect on the challenges faced by them in the increasingly internationalized academic environment and have an integrated response to these challenges. However, in reality, it is not easy for an institution with different disciplines and functional units to reflect and respond "as a whole". For example, in the study by Hyland, Trahar, Anderson and Dickens, staff and students commented that even though cultural diversity is present among staff and students, there is still some way to go in forming truly international communities. "Local" students and staff are still somewhat resistant to accept "foreign" students, as interaction with them can be difficult, and the challenge is not always enjoyable (Hyland et al. 2008: 17 & 19).

Anthony Welch, in a recent article published in 2012, provides another new perspective on the "commodification" or "commercialization" aspect of

internationalization of higher education, in the case of Australia. The major "host countries" of international students, such as U.S., U.K. and Australia have been criticized for the commodification of their internationalization efforts, which Welch describes as "Entrepreneurial Internationalization", and "Opportunistic Entrepreneurialism" (Welch 2012: 308 & 310). Welch's argument is also related to the complex phenomenon of globalization and its intimate relationship with the internationalization of higher education, similar to the above critiques of internationalization raised by Altbach, Knight and Jiang. According to Welch, a much more entrepreneurial direction has changed the rationale and character of the internationalization of Australian higher education, which has been driven by forces of global economic restructuring; however, adopting an entrepreneurial approach may reduce quality and emphasize salesmanship over accurate claims as to the service being "sold" to students (Ibid: 300). Several downsides related to this type of "Entrepreneurial Internationalization" have emerged in recent years, including: declining staff-student ratios; massive growth in enrolments; increasing resort to marginal funding; substituting tenure with contract and teaching only appointments; rising managerialism; and declining morale and increasing resentment among academic staff (Ibid: 298). Welch warns that higher education institutions engaging in market-like behavior, may potentially be damaging to the quality and reputation of systems and institutions, as well as services to students. Institutions should focus more on the "genuine" aspects and benefits of internationalization, such as cultural exchange based on reciprocity and mutuality (which, I think, is similar to Turner & Robson's notion of "reciprocal internationalization), rather than going towards the direction of "opportunistic entrepreneurialism" that focuses primarily on revenues and salesmanship (Ibid: 310).

Going back to the argument of "Western" domination in the internationalization process, Mok raises another critique on internationalization that universities in Asia have tried to internationalize by following "Anglo-Saxon models". He hopes that universities will become more aware of the "dangers" of new imperialism in education. Living in a postcolonial context such as Hong Kong, researchers should be more critical about what they have learned from the "West" and be careful not to confuse "internationalization" with "globalization" or "Americanization" (Mok 2007: 448-449). I agree that, very often, university strategies and policies are formulated according to global practices and standards. I recall when talking to faculty members and administrators, I have heard several times about how the establishment of the University was based on "the Princeton Model". If internationalization is simply "copying the West" without deepening cross-cultural understanding among those from different backgrounds, it will be difficult for "local" students to actually see the benefits and participate proactively.

vii. Studies of Internationalization of Higher Education – Hong Kong

For studies of internationalization of higher education in Hong Kong, I first examined *KDU* itself. According to the Academic Development Proposal of the current triennium (2009-2012) published by *KDU* in 2008, cross-cultural experience is an important learning component in campus life. The immediate target, according to the proposal, is to increase the number of non-local undergraduate students to 20% of the annual intake. Of the non-local undergraduate intake, the long-term target is 50% from mainland China and 50% from overseas (*KDU* 2008: 18). From these examples, it seems that a majority of the "internationalization" efforts is focused on "increasing the number of non-local students". I believed that interviews conducted

with the major stakeholders would reveal whether this growth in non-local student numbers has actually attributed to students' cross-cultural experiences.

Furthermore, there will be plans to improve cross-cultural understanding by promoting interaction among students, staff and community leaders through various programs. By working with local student and overseas student groups, events will be organized to raise multicultural awareness, such as International Education Week, roundtable discussion of multicultural issues, cultural exchange programs, and field trips to overseas institutions (ibid).

In a cover story on "Internationalization at *KDU*" published in the University's newsletter in April 2011, currently the University hosts approximately 600 exchange-in students from around the world annually, and the annual full-time non-local undergraduate intake has reached 16%, almost hitting the 20% target, with a 50/50 split between students from Mainland and the rest of the world (*KDU* 2011b: 5). For non-local student enrollment across three years' of undergraduate study, according to statistics published by the UGC, the split between those from Mainland and the rest of the world, was 58% and 42% respectively, with the overall percentage of non-local student enrolment (across the three years) at 13% *(see UGC's online statistics database, at http://cdcf.ugc.edu.hk/cdcf/statIndex.do?language=EN, under Student (Headcount), Table #9, Non-local Student Enrolment (Headcount) of UGC-funded Programmes, by Institution, Level of Study, Place of Origin and Mode of Study, Academic Year 2010/11 – 2011/12).*

Every year, the University brings in world-renowned scientists, scholars and community leaders to deliver seminars, talks and speeches to students as

enrichment to their learning experience. It also collaborates with numerous top institutions around the world in research, student/faculty exchange and joint programs (Ibid: 6). This strategy is further emphasized in the five-year plan (2011-2016), with initiatives to "enhance *KDU*'s branding profile by planning and executing a number of global initiatives of strategic importance" (*KDU* 2011c: 10).

Starting from the 2012/13 academic year, Hong Kong's undergraduate degree programs will undergo transition from three-year to four-year curriculum, and the additional year offers opportunities to integrate courses in the curriculum to further develop students' global mindset, and to organize co-curricular activities to enhance students' international exposures. The development of a new four-year curriculum is commended by the Quality Assurance Council (QAC), which is a semi-autonomous body under the UGC, in its audit report on *KDU* (QAC 2010: 11). Further details on the context of the institution will be presented at the beginning of the next chapter (Chapter 3).

According to Knight and de Wit, the term "strategies" characterizes initiatives which are taken by an institution of higher learning to integrate an international dimension into research, teaching and service functions as well as management policies and systems (Knight & de Wit 1995: 17). In the "ideal" world, internationalization has already been achieved at *KDU* through strategies outlined in the Academic Development Proposal, figures and statistics presented in its publications, as well as commendations by the Quality Assurance Council. However, in "reality", improving cross-cultural understanding may not be as easily achievable as the decision makers and administrators think, as shown in the following internationalization-related studies conducted in Hong Kong and Asia.

Firstly, issues surrounding the composition of Hong Kong's non-local student body have been raised by different researchers. From Kell & Vogl's comparison of "education hubs" in Hong Kong, Singapore and Malaysia, they question the claim that Hong Kong's higher education has been "internationalized", with a large proportion of Mainland Chinese and a relatively small number from other countries forming the non-local cohort (2012: 70). Even though Hong Kong has special immigration arrangements under the Basic Law, the categorization of Mainland Chinese as "non-locals" does not seem to accurately represent the picture of student mobility in the Pearl River Delta. According to Kell & Vogl, the Director of the British Council in Hong Kong predicted that by 2015, many of these "education hubs" would be in greater China instead, and Hong Kong will remain a popular destination for Mainland Chinese, but not as popular for other nationalities (Ibid: 69).

In the study by Oleksiyenko, Cheng & Yip, in the past decade (2000-2010), the number of students from Mainland China soared, while the number of students from outside Hong Kong and Mainland China remained relatively low. Even though Hong Kong is a global city with a quality education infrastructure, they think that its role as a supplier of international education is yet to be fully established (2012: 9-11). Ng agrees that, according to UGC statistics, currently the majority of non-local students are still coming from Mainland China (Ng 2012: 3) and there is an urgency to attract students from other Asian countries for the purpose of internationalizing higher education in Hong Kong. Although this trend is also observed by worldwide studies on student mobility such as the OECD report on education as discussed in Chapter 1, I think these "warning signs" are still valid and influential to how internationalization strategies are formulated among higher education institutions in Hong Kong.

Ng raises another concern of dissatisfaction among non-local students, mostly due to the lack of social interaction with local students. A study in 2009 showed that local students did not have great interest in interacting with the non-local (including both Mainland Chinese and international) students. He suggests an "open cultural ethos" should be nurtured among students as well as academic and administrative support staff, in order to achieve the "humanistic concerns" related to internationalization, such as fostering cultural awareness and civic values (Ng 2010: 13).

A recent article by Simon Marginson provides further explanation on the "Otherness" often experienced by international students studying abroad. The dominant approach in counseling psychology models, according to Marginson, put international education into a journey of "adjustment" – international students "adjust" to the host culture, but not vice versa (Marginson 2012: 12). Quite often, international students joining a new education system and living environment, are being "variously constructed" as "supplicants, strangers, outsiders, consumers, social isolates and people in learning or linguistics deficit" (Ibid: 9). Evidence suggests that most international students want friendship with local students; however, many locals form enclosed networks and self-segregate away from them. Even though international students want to befriend the locals, many are disappointed due to local students' indifference (Ibid: 13, 15). Marginson proposes, from his research findings from interviews with 200 international students in Australia, that factors such as communication, lack of knowledge and perceived cultural difference may have magnified the "Outsiderness" of international students, and the differences in turn become separation and stigma (Ibid: 19). In reality, the "cosmopolitan" student who tolerates a measure of ambiguity, plurality and cultural mixing, and who can augment

their original identity while shaping new intercultural relations, seems to be the happiest and most successful (Ibid: 13). I believe that, by interviewing both local and non-local students at *KDU*, I will be able to determine whether similar feelings of dissatisfaction are shared among our non-local students, and whether self-segregation from non-locals exists among our local students.

viii. Studies of Internationalization of Higher Education – UK, US & Australia

After looking at studies in Hong Kong for internationalization of higher education, similar studies in U.K., U.S. and Australia are reviewed in this section in order to reveal whether institutions in the Hong Kong context have (or have not) been faced with similar issues, problems or conflicts arising from internationalization strategies in these places, which were involved in hosting international students and internationalization of their higher education system long before Hong Kong.

First is a study by Jackson & Huddart (2010: 80-82) on Newcastle University's (U.K.) strategic objective "to deliver international excellence in learning, teaching and scholarship activities, whilst providing an excellent all-round student experience". Students from the University's School of Agriculture, Food and Rural Development (AFRD), which had generally been characterized as not being culturally diverse, were surveyed in this research. The long-term intention of the research was to understand how these students could best be exposed to international learning, and how such learning could be incorporated into new modules of these programs.

Findings revealed three basic themes: 1. "Internationalization" is an academic term; 2. Students have no expectation of gaining an international education

from Newcastle University; and 3. There is enthusiasm for having international learning incorporated into modules. It appeared that the University had not effectively transferred the term "internationalization" from being academic in nature to a term that students associated with learning, which was a gap between policy and practicalities that often appeared in internationalization efforts by higher education institutions. According to the survey results, a majority of participants strongly agreed that internationalization was the responsibility of the entire university. Also, valuable learning experience could be gained from working with international students. Group work would be a way of fostering cross-cultural relationships, as well as some reflective learning exercises. Contrary to views in the literature, survey participants expressed that attending events for celebrating multiculturalism would not help them become more internationalized (Ibid: 102). Jackson & Huddart's study reflected the "reality" that students' perspectives on internationalization may be different from policymakers. Therefore, evaluation of the effectiveness of internationalization strategies implementation should be based on both administrators' and students perspectives, which were what I gathered as part of the data collection in my study.

A study involving focus groups in UK higher education institutions conducted by Trahar & Hyland in 2011 also examined how staff and students perceived and debated the concept of "internationalization". Findings from focus groups revealed that in the U.K. context, the distinction between "home" and "international" students often remained ambiguous, which was similar to Trahar's discussion on local students' perspectives on "Internationalization at Home" (Trahar 2011: 80). Other issues were the lack of interaction between students of diverse cultures, and the need for understanding of how learning and teaching practices were culturally mediated (Trahar & Hyland 2011: 627). Cultural norms and academic

traditions should be recognized, and group work should be incorporated into an internationalized curriculum, so that intercultural collaborative work could become routine and expected by students (Ibid: 629-630). In another study by Gu et al., findings also suggested there were gaps between "home" and "international" students' values and behaviors, which caused challenges for academic and social integration (2010: 17). Half of the respondents, who were first-year international undergraduates at four universities in the U.K., were "unhappy with their social life", with feelings of "powerlessness" and "lack of a sense of belonging" (Ibid). However, over time, Gu et al. discovered that the understanding of the "host" (U.K.) culture by international students had improved, and students became more accepting to those with different attitudes and values and more appreciative of their own cultural values as well (Ibid: 18). It seemed that the problem with integrating students from different backgrounds was not unique to Hong Kong's context, but also in the U.K. as well as other places with a less homogenous "local" student body. However, positive intercultural experiences did help in students' adaptation and personal development in the so-called "foreign" learning context.

Related to intercultural group work, another study by Ippolito aimed to explore intercultural learning in the context of multicultural student populations and the realities of students' and teachers' experiences. According to Ippolito, the ideal international curriculum provided equal learning ambitions for all students (2007: 749). It could be argued that the key to successfully internationalizing the curriculum was the understanding of the interconnectedness between "home" and "international" students' multiple identities, positioning and needs.

A majority of the students recognized cultural and national diversity as impacting their group's performance both positively and negatively, and all agreed that there were benefits of working in international, multicultural groups. However, students identified that, given the choice, many learners would naturally choose co-nationals as group-mates (Ibid: 755). One of the notable barriers to intercultural learning proposed by Ippolito, based on students' responses, is *Privileged Knowledge.* This meant that international students had high expectations on how much advice they would receive from home students, and were disappointed by the lack of peer learning. Local (or home) students might claim superior knowledge over international students rather than engage in mutual learning (Ibid: 760). Other barriers included academic and time pressure, lack of interest in learning about other cultures, and language proficiency.

I would like to share some personal experience here. At an office meeting I once attended to discuss ways to integrate local and non-local students studying at *KDU*, a number of administrators agreed that incorporating cross-cultural group work in the curriculum would be an effective way to "mix" the students. However, according to my own study experience as an EdD student, my classmates, including myself, tend to find group mates of the same ethnic background when working in groups for in-class presentations. I agree with Ippolito that culturally diverse working groups take longer to collaborate effectively, and when there is time pressure involved, students would tend to work within their "comfort zone", as it would have higher guarantee for success, such as getting a better grade on group reports and presentations. Hong Kong students, according to my own experience, tend to be more competitive and result-oriented (I recall during lunch breaks at the weekend EdD modules, one of the most popular topics was about completing the EdD as soon as

possible.) The taught modules usually have tight schedules, and students are asked to do a group presentation with little over one day's preparation time. Although there are not many non-local students in the EdD program in Hong Kong, local students still tend to work together with other locals, as less time is needed to socialize and become familiar with group mates from different backgrounds before working together.

Further to Ippolito's point about "privileged knowledge", a study by Li et al. showed that for Chinese learners in the U.K., their performance in classroom did not necessarily relate to their performance academically (2010: 390). Some observations on Asian students' inactive classroom behavior may be caused by difficulty in adjusting to an educational environment which was characterized by more independent learning and less supervision and guidance. However, results from their study revealed that Chinese learners who had never studied abroad before were likely to have higher achievements in their current studies, than those who have prior experience in studying aboard (Ibid: 401). Still, they suggested that organizing social and cultural events and increasing face-to-face communications between tutors and students in less formal ways would help students gain more confidence in carrying out their studies. (Ibid: 402).

Findings from the study by Li et al. seemed to contradict Ippolito's notion of "privileged knowledge". So, what would be the reason for those who have never studied abroad to have higher achievements in their current studies? Interestingly, I have observed from my personal experience at *KDU* that non-local students from Mainland China, who have never studied abroad, also have higher academic achievement than those from other countries, or even those from Hong Kong. This somewhat corroborated with the research findings by Li et al., and it also reflected

that those from Mainland China hold some kind of "privileged knowledge" that gave them an edge over their local and international counterparts. I believe the "privileged knowledge" probably came from more rigorous secondary school curriculum and university entrance exams which the Mainland Chinese students have undergone prior to entering universities in Hong Kong. My interviews with local and international students addressed whether there were any issues and/or difficulties in working with Mainland Chinese students, who may possess some "privileged knowledge".

In her study conducted in 2009, Turner introduced another (rather bleak) perspective on group learning in an intercultural environment. She explored the relationship between curriculum design, teacher perceptions and student experience of intercultural learning (2009: 242). The study was conducted in a cross-cultural management module delivered within a taught Master's degree in a U.K. university. Most students have little prior overseas living experience, and most international students have not previously worked in small groups during their studies. Analysis was mainly focused on commentaries in individual students' reflective journals about their experience in group work. Several notable themes emerged from the analysis; the first was challenges affecting group work. The challenges included cross-cultural misunderstandings about interpersonal relationships, literacy gaps and other inequalities within the groups. Only a few commentaries indicated that groups had considered strategies to provide support to each other. Turner mentioned that stereotypes of U.K. and Chinese students also affected the quality of group work, and international students were disappointed that the locals were unwilling to spend social time with them even in designated in-class breaks (Ibid: 244-246).

In terms of group behavior, Turner highlighted the learner inequalities and basic interpersonal differences between local and international students. Asian students newly arrived in the U.K. were regarded as "the lowest in the pecking order" in spite of their excellent academic results, which reflected that academic attainment or intellectual ability did not play a role in perceptions of personal power. Another example of learner inequalities was that local students perceived "success" as initiating outsiders into local ways of doing things, while international students identified "success" as adapting quickly to class and group norms established by local students (Ibid: 249-251). Turner was disappointed that the attempt for social and cultural integration through the inclusion of group work in the curriculum design did not seem to work as effectively as she had anticipated. She had made some suggestions for redesigning the curriculum to further challenge the "home" and "visitors" dynamics, but she concluded that higher education classrooms would remain dominated by the local rather than the international, and all students would need to continue to struggle with the global consequences of intercultural inequalities (Ibid: 254).

Besides students, other important stakeholders such as faculty members and administrators may also face problems and barriers of internationalization at the teaching and operational level. In a study by Dewey and Duff, faculty's views were collected on the internationalization processes at the School of Architecture and Allied Arts (A&AA) of the University of Oregon (U.S.). Ten academic departments were under the A&AA, with programs at undergraduate and graduate level. Since 2005, "internationalization" had been reinvigorated by new administrative leaders of the School. The University's mission statement on internationalization is "commitment to international awareness and understanding, and to the development of a faculty and

student body that are capable of participating effectively in a global society" (Dewey & Duff 2009: 492). According to the findings, there were 4 major barriers to faculty involvement in international activities at A&AA: 1. General lack of coordination and information available regarding engagement in international initiatives; 2. Constraints due to limited funding; 3. Existing administrative policies and procedures that serve as disincentives to participation in international initiatives; and 4. Lack of support staff and personnel to facilitate international initiatives (Ibid: 496).

Most importantly, Dewey and Duff felt that the objective of "internationalization" had not been clearly defined by the administrative leaders. The mismatch between institutional intentions and support mechanisms was exacerbated by the expectation, due to an embedded organizational culture, that individual faculty can and will support virtually all extra work associated with pursuing an internationalization imperative (Ibid: 501). They concluded that passion for internationalization was not enough, as internationalization must be addressed systematically. Also, internationalization must take on the form of an individual-institutional partnership. Faculty and university administrators must work together to implement a comprehensive internationalization process, regardless of whether the strategic plans are centralized or decentralized (Ibid: 503).

Maureen Bell also described a case study of an Australian university that explored the views of academic staff regarding the relevance of internationalization to the curriculum. From participant accounts, Bell developed a "spectrum of acceptance" with four clear positions on academic staff's stance on internationalizing the curriculum. On "left" of the spectrum, there were two levels: 1. Internationalization would have a negative impact; and 2. Internationalization is inappropriate (Bell 2004:

54). On "right" of the spectrum, the two other levels were: 3. Internationalization of content is possible; and 4. Internationalization is integral (Ibid: 55 & 57). According to Bell, academic staff considered some disciplines more "amenable" to internationalization than others, resulting in the different perspectives on internationalizing the curriculum. Most importantly, in order to convince them of the value of internationalization, there needed to be clear communication on "what it means", and "how it might be relevant"; Bell concluded that "what is taught" should not be separated from "how it is taught" when considering internationalization of the curriculum from academic staff's perspective (2004: 60).

In another qualitative study conducted by Sheridan in an Irish third level institution, she noted a level of mismatch between staff expectations and international students' discourse skills, such as writing long essays. (2011: 135-136). Almost all students noted difficulties in mixing with Irish students and making Irish friends. Sheridan concluded that not only should home students be more inclusive to those who speak another language, faculty members should also be encouraged to foster cooperation across traditional disciplines, in order for the institution to develop a holistic approach to managing student diversity, and to cope with the increasingly intercultural teaching and learning environment (Ibid: 138). What Sheridan suggested may help integrate the divides in the "spectrum of acceptance" proposed by Bell, and that faculty members may learn from one another and may break away from the common belief that "some disciplines are more 'amenable' to internationalization than others."

Lastly, I believed that if similar studies were conducted in *KDU* among faculty members, they may also lead to similar findings, such as lack of clear

definition of "internationalization", disincentives to participate in international initiatives and lack of support from the university to facilitate international initiatives. I was interested, therefore, to compare how faculty members at *KDU* saw themselves in the picture of internationalization strategies implementation, and how they evaluated the effectiveness of the strategies.

ix. Chapter Summary

In this literature review, I first researched the history of internationalization of higher education developments from the Middle Ages up to the present. Only in recent decades, did Asian countries begin "entering the scene" of internationalizing higher education, as the first working definitions were derived from so-called "Western" influences. The lack of linkages between Chinese and Western education heritages has resulted in the local definition of internationalization laden with cases of "Western borrowings", such as policies related to the creation of "regional education hubs" and the direct copying of "Anglo-Saxon models" in many Asian universities. I have also reviewed some major critiques on internationalization of higher education, including its interchangeable use with "globalization", its implication on the commercialization and commodification of higher education, issues surrounding the notion of "entrepreneurial internationalization" that puts revenue ahead of quality and service, as well as the predominately "Western" models of internationalization processes.

Another important concept related to internationalization of higher education, "Internationalization at Home", was researched. Past studies conducted in Hong Kong, U.K., U.S. and Australia show that very often, key stakeholders

including students, faculty members, and administrators, do not always appreciate or experience the benefits of internationalization on campus or in the curriculum. In some cases, this is due to several issues; for examples, how "non-local" students are categorized, such as the current situation in Hong Kong; ambiguity of the distinction between "home" and "international" students, such as the cases in the U.K.; struggles or indifference among students within an intercultural learning environment; inequalities and privileged knowledge among different groups of students; and lack of communication between policymakers and academic staff on the aims and feasibility of internationalizing the curriculum. These cases and studies were useful references for my own research, as they formed the basis of my inquiry on the topic of internationalization strategies implementation at *KDU.*

Overall, I enjoyed the process of reviewing literature, as not only have I found research studies which have helped me understand more about the background and developments of internationalization, but it has also been encouraging to find similar studies conducted by researchers from institutions in different parts of the world. The research design and methods they used, the questions they asked, and their research findings gave me valuable ideas when I was at the early stages of designing the methodology of my own research study. Interestingly, little has been written in academic literature about key stakeholders' (students, faculty members and administrators) perspectives on internationalization, and their evaluation of the effectiveness of strategies implementation, for universities in Hong Kong. Therefore, I hope my research study will contribute to this area in the studies of internationalization of higher education in Hong Kong.

Chapter 3 – Research Methodology

i. Approach and Rationale of the Research Methodology

Based on the research questions to be investigated in this study, a research methodology was needed to ensure that the research was approached in an appropriate way to generate meaningful findings. In this chapter, I will discuss the approach and rationale of the methodology used in this study, who participated, how the data were gathered and analyzed, as well as the ethical issues related to the research.

There are several major paradigms in social science research. First, there is the positivist perspective that draws mainly on quantitative techniques such as experiments, surveys and data analysis. There is also the interpretivist that utilizes qualitative techniques such as case studies, participant observation and interviews. Nevertheless, educational research is different from traditional positivist research, as positivism holds the worldview that "knowledge" and "non-knowledge" could be distinguished through disciplined, rigorous and systematic research, and a researcher's concerns and values must not interfere with the process of discovering the universal truth (Usher 1996: 11-12). According to Wilfred Carr, "value" is an important aspect in educational research. He argues that educational research is always value-laden because it cannot be separated from philosophical reflection, argumentation and critical examination of the values which the researcher seeks to foster and promote (Carr 1995: 98). Educational research investigates human activity, with an aim to discover meaning within social interactions; therefore, it would be impossible for researchers to detach themselves entirely from values in history, culture, discourses and social structures (Usher 1996: 15).

As a result of the collective beliefs, values and techniques shared by members of a given research community, "paradigms" are created, which function as maps or guides in determining important problems or issues for members to address, and defining acceptable theories, explanations and methods in solving these problems (Ibid: 16). Jurgen Habermas, a German philosopher who has published major works in social theory and philosophy since the early 1960s, holds the view that knowledge is related to human interests, and the choice of a research paradigm implies a preference for the particular values which the paradigm sustains (Carr 1995: 93). This also has implications for me as a researcher, as my values would influence my preference for a particular research paradigm. According to Habermas, each research paradigm has different research methods, form of research knowledge and practical purpose, which supports a specific theory of human nature and educational philosophy. Therefore, classifying my research according to one of the major paradigms is useful in understanding the educational values and human interests which the research seeks to maintain and inquire.

Based on the above classification and my values and beliefs, this study is most appropriately located within the *interpretivist paradigm*. According to Bassey (1990: 42), data collected by this research paradigm are usually verbal, such as fieldwork notes, transcripts of conversation, and participant observation (ethnographic study). Data are analyzed with qualitative methods, and the objective is to interpret the phenomena of the world based on social meanings. Rubin & Rubin (2012: 19) also mentions in the discussion of the variations on the core paradigms, that the interpretivist understands that people look at matters through "distinct lenses" and reach somewhat different conclusions, which may be conflicting, but can be true at the same time. In this study, the research was mainly based on one institution, which

is *KDU*. Collection of data included subjective accounts of stakeholders' personal experiences and observations on the University's internationalization and effectiveness of strategy implementation, as well as my own reflections on internationalization experiences in the local higher education sector. By analyzing these data, I will interpret the context of these observations (subjective, descriptive and historical) with an aim to construct "realities" of the implementation of the internationalization strategies and to find out whether there are any "missing links" between the "ideals" formulated by the decision makers and "realities" faced by key stakeholders, which will help answer the research questions in the study. This clearly demonstrates that the research methodology to be adopted in the study agrees with Bassey's and Rubin & Rubin's description of the interpretivist paradigm.

ii. Strengths and Limitations of the Philosophical Perspective and Methodology

The interpretivist paradigm can also be referred to as the "historical hermeneutic" paradigm. The word "hermeneutic" is derived from the Greek messenger god Hermes, whose task was to understand and interpret what the gods had to say to humans. "Historical hermeneutic", on the other hand, not only deals with the understanding and interpretation of what a person says, but also the seeing or reading of a person's "context", such as what the person embodies in life, i.e. his or her "history".

Hans-Georg Gadamer, another philosopher who published his major works in the 1960s, approaches the interpretivist paradigm with new insights. In his most famous work, *Truth and Method*, published in 1960, Gadamer holds the view that a person is always a "person-in-community". Therefore, analysis of human action

must take account of the "horizons" of the researcher, as well as the subject being analyzed, which Gadamer refers to as the "fusion of horizons". Moreover, Gadamer raises another theory of the "hermeneutic circle of interpretation", which explains the strength of the interpretivist paradigm (Usher 1996: 19). Gadamer believes that human action is meaningful, and interpretations of human action in research are always "circular", with knowledge created by the interaction of part and whole. These interpretations are also made against a background of "traditions", which includes assumptions, presuppositions, beliefs and practices in a particular research context (Ibid). That way, personal contexts become part of the "truth" that arises out of the fusion of horizons and circle of interpretation. Compared to the positivist research paradigm, in which the researcher should be "remote / detached" from the object / text being studied and should approach it "innocently" without any presuppositions, the interpretivist paradigm embraces the "values" of the researcher. Only when the researcher gets "into" the "hermeneutic circle" and begins interacting with the object / text ("the part"), can he / she interpret the true meaning of "the whole".

In my study, tradition could be referred to as different teaching and learning practices of East and West. With internationalization of higher education, there is a need to bridge different pedagogic cultures so that students' learning experience would not be compromised by the implementation of an internationalization strategy. I added together my personal experience (interpretation of "the part") with those of other stakeholders (interpretation of "the whole") to create the "hermeneutic circle of interpretation". This circular interpretation was the key to developing central themes from the analysis of data collected from key stakeholders in my study, which will be discussed in Chapter 7.

However, the interpretivist paradigm is not without limitations. It can be argued that the qualitative methods commonly used in this paradigm are more easily subject to errors of human judgment than the more scientific quantitative methods. The "fusion of horizons", even though it is useful for interpretation of meanings, can also lead to misunderstandings and misinterpretations, especially when the researcher and / or the object / text to be analyzed have a biased "horizon" in the first place. Kvale also raises the issue of possible "leading questions" formulated by the researcher/interviewer may inadvertently influence the answers (1996: 235). Another weakness of the interpretivist paradigm, compared to the positivist, is that the richness in the context makes it impossible to be repeated by another researcher and yield the same result, which is referred to as the research reliability (Silverman 2005). However, qualitative researchers recognize that their studies cannot be replicated and do not set out with that intention.

Another limitation, albeit a more personal one, is the time needed to transcribe and analyze the data collected from qualitative methods. I understood that quantitative methods (such as questionnaires) can outreach to a larger sample in less time, and the data can be analyzed in less time-consuming ways (using excel spreadsheets, etc.), but data collected from these methods would not be as detailed and in-depth as one-to-one qualitative methods (such as interviews). However, as I was working alone in this study, at times during the data collection and analysis process, I felt overwhelmed by too much context-rich data, which meant that I spent more time and effort in the study than previously anticipated.

iii. Sources and Collection of Data – Context of the Institution

There were two sources of data gathered for this study – 1. Documents and publications related to *KDU*'s strategic development, and 2. Interviews with key stakeholders. The data gathered and analyzed was used mainly to help answer the second and third research questions related to the decision makers' and key stakeholders' views on the effectiveness of internationalization strategies implementation.

Since the study is focused on one institution (*KDU*), I have also reviewed documents and publications related to *KDU*'s strategic development. Some preliminary details of the documents and publications reviewed have already been described and discussed in *Section vii* of the previous chapter, and the following provides more contextual background of the institution. The purpose of reviewing these documents and considering the context background was to explore "on paper" *KDU*'s strategies and targets on internationalization, undergraduate education, and student recruitment, such as recruitment targets of non-local students, internationalization initiatives, and curriculum development.

KDU admitted its first batch of students in October 1991, which was then the "sunset period" of British colonial administration. Compared to two other local research universities, The University of Hong Kong (established in 1911) and The Chinese University of Hong Kong (established in 1963), *KDU* has a relatively short history, but in just over 20 years, it has achieved impressive results in international "league tables", with the most outstanding ranking being "Asia's Number One" in the QS (Quacquarelli Symonds) Rankings (information obtained from *KDU*'s website,

and also mentioned by several interviewees during the interview; more details on interviewees' responses are covered in Chapters 4 to 6). The institution's culture, which followed a "model" of research universities in the U.S., distinguished itself from the status quo at the time, and with foresight about the potential role of science and technology in post-1997 Hong Kong (Postiglione 2011: 64). The following is *KDU*'s mission statement, taken from the introductory section of its website:

> "To advance learning and knowledge through teaching and research, particularly, (i) in science, technology, engineering, management and business studies; and (ii) at the postgraduate level; and to assist in the economic and social development of Hong Kong."

A key to fulfilling its global vision of becoming a "world-class university at the cutting edge internationally in all targeted fields of pursuit" (statement taken from *KDU*'s website) was recruiting first-class academics from around the world. The top scholars who joined *KDU* at the beginning gradually attracted other senior academics from North America, Asia and Europe, who shared the vision of the University becoming a world-class research institution. Today, all regular faculty members at *KDU* (over 460) have doctorates, and 80% received their doctorate from or were employed at twenty-four of the top universities in the world. Many of them were originally from Hong Kong, Taiwan or Mainland China, and received their education in or taught at overseas (mostly U.S.) universities (Ibid: 66). In addition, several measures were launched at *KDU* that would eventually be seen in other universities, including: 1. Putting research on an equal footing with teaching; 2. Relying on an entrepreneurial approach to development; 3. Appointing rather than electing deans; and 4. Requiring students to enrol in social science and humanities courses outside their science and technology specialization.

In terms of curriculum at the undergraduate level, *KDU*'s objective in undergraduate education is to provide 1. Top quality training in students' chosen fields of study; 2. All-round development of students' creativity, innovativeness, critical thinking, global outlook, and cultural awareness; and 3. A campus life that prepares students to be leaders and lifelong learners (information obtained from *KDU*'s website). Since its establishment in 1991 up until 2012, *KDU* offered 3-year undergraduate degree programs in Science, Engineering, and Business & Management that required a minimum of 102 credits. However, almost all non-local students from Mainland China, and some non-local students from other countries, who studied in a 12-year instead of 13-year school system prior to entering university, were required to enroll in a "Preparatory Year (Year 0)" program, with an additional 18 credits. Starting from the 2012/13 academic year, all universities in Hong Kong transferred to a 4-year undergraduate curriculum, and *KDU* is now offering 4-year undergraduate degree programs that require a minimum of 120 credits. It is also offering interdisciplinary and dual-degree programs, as well as a new undergraduate program in Humanities and Social Science (in Global China Studies). Under the new 4-year curriculum, non-local students are no longer required to enrol in the "Preparatory Year (Year 0)" program. All undergraduate courses, except for some electives in Chinese language or art/culture, are taught in English.

Like other local universities, *KDU* has been actively promoting its undergraduate programs overseas and admitting non-local students since 2005. In that year, a 15-year Strategic Plan was developed, and its plan to "re-engineer the undergraduate study" included a strategy of promoting diversity and international exposure by "expanding overseas exchange/internships, and rapidly increasing enrolment of non-local students." (*KDU* 2005: 11). This plan was reinforced in

another 5-year Strategy Plan published in 2011, which included an "international and mainland strategy" to "proactively recruit the best international students" (*KDU* 2011c: 10). As mentioned in *Section vii* of the previous chapter (Chapter 2), the annual full-time non-local undergraduate intake has almost hit the 20% maximum quota allowed by the HKSAR Government, with a 50/50 split between students from Mainland and the rest of the world (*KDU* 2011b: 5).

The total undergraduate student cohort in the 2011/12 academic year was around 6,500 students, it has jumped to around 8,700 in the 2012/13 academic year (started in September 2012), due to the "double cohort" effect of the last batch of students entering the 3-year curriculum coinciding with the first batch of students entering the new 4-year curriculum; however, the intake quota of non-local students had not "doubled", as the "double cohort" was considered only a temporary and transitional measure. In 2012, *KDU* admitted around 380 non-local undergraduates, with 55% from overseas and 45% from Mainland China and Taiwan, and so far, the University has admitted international undergraduates from 64 different nationalities (figures and statistics obtained from a press release published in November 2012.)

The "success story" of *KDU* was featured in a 2011 publication, *The Road to Academic Excellence*, edited by Altbach and Salmi, with a chapter written by Gerard Postiglione on the history and development of *KDU*, as a case of an "unprecedented rise within one decade into the ranks of the so-called world-class research universities" (Postiglione 2011: 90). During a number of interviews I have done with students, faculty members as well as administrators, they have also attributed *KDU*'s quick success to its internationalization strategies.

iv. Sources and Collection of Data – Interview with Key Stakeholders

In terms of the "attitude" of key stakeholders about the effectiveness of the internationalization strategies, undergraduate students, teaching faculty and administrators were interviewed. Since the focus of the study is on *KDU*, a non-probability, purposive sampling of students, faculty and staff from *KDU* was an appropriate source of data for the interviews (Lewin 2005: 218). As a member of staff of the University, I could get access to this sample for the purpose of my study. Realistically, I was not able to interview all undergraduates, teaching faculty and administrative staff; therefore, I started with a "convenience sample" of people I know from the University. There are four Schools in *KDU* (Science, Engineering, Business, and Humanities & Social Science), with the first three offering undergraduate programs since its official opening, and the School of Humanities & Social Science offering its first undergraduate major program (in Global China Studies) from the 2011/12 academic year. My target was to interview at least four students studying in different disciplines, including "local" (meaning that he/she has previously been educated in Hong Kong) and "non-local" (meaning that he/she has been previously educated outside Hong Kong). For teaching faculty, I set out to interview at least four faculty members (one from each School) who have experience in teaching undergraduate courses. Lastly, for administrative staff, I planned to interview at least four administrators who had worked closely with local and non-local students in areas of recruitment and admissions, exchange, and support services. These interviews would generate a triangulation of data by combining different ways of looking at the same issues, and would draw a "full picture" of experiences by those immersed in the day-to-day teaching, learning and operational environment (students, faculty and administrators) (Silverman 2005: 177).

The interviews were conducted from December 2011 to June 2012, and in total, 15 interviews were conducted, with five from each group of stakeholders. A description of the profiles of the interviewees will be provided at the beginning of each chapter on analysis of data collected from each group (Chapters 4, 5 & 6). Each interview lasted between 30 to 45 minutes and was tape recorded. After the interviews, a transcript (in English, with interviews conducted in other dialects such as Cantonese and Putonghua translated by myself) was sent to the interviewees for verification and comments, and a fixed period of time was given to provide feedback. The interviewees were also asked to sign a Consent Form at the start of the interview that they agreed for the interview to be used in my research dissertation and any subsequent publications arising from the dissertation. They will also remain anonymous, and have the right to change and/or omit any part of their response within two weeks upon receipt of the interview transcript. A template of the Consent Form is included in *Appendix 1*.

According to Kvale (1996: 13), interview research is "a craft that, if well carried out, can become an art." I found that, through the experience of interviewing students, faculty members and colleagues, I have entered into what Kvale expresses in German – *Bildungsreise*, which is a "scholarly journey" of discovery, for me, as well as my readers, of new understandings and insights on the topic of my research (Ibid: 4). I believe that the interview is a powerful method, in terms of this study, to learn about how different "horizons" and "lenses" of various stakeholders come together to construct the "realities" of internationalization of higher education in Hong Kong, which may or may not corroborate with each other, but can be true at the same time. On the other hand, I do acknowledge that there are weaknesses in the interview as a method in my study, mostly due to the fact that I am the sole researcher, as well as the

only "instrument" to obtain information from interviewees. Therefore, the credibility of this research study relies on the knowledge, experience as well as the integrity of me being the sole investigator (Ibid: 117).

v. *Structure of the Interviews*

According to Fontana and Frey (in Punch 2009: 145), interviews are classified in three ways – structured, semi-structured and unstructured. The degree of structure in the interview determines its depth; the less the interview is structured, the greater the depth it tries to go into. Different types of interviews have strengths, weaknesses and purposes in research. The type of interview to be selected should be aligned with the strategy, purpose and research questions of the study (Ibid: 146). Referring to the research questions of this study, there are specific areas of the effectiveness of internationalization strategies implementation that I aimed to find out from interviewing key stakeholders, which required a more structured and pre-planned question set. At the same time, I also intended to find out from stakeholders their perspective, attitude and interpretation of the internationalization strategies implementation, which could only be obtained from less structured and open-ended questions. Combining these two aims, the format of the interviews was semi-structured, with a number of the same fixed questions for each group of interviewees, and some time for them to share their thoughts and feelings towards internationalization at *KDU* and how they have been affected one way or the other.

The interviews for faculty members and administrators contained 16 questions, while the interviews for students contained 19 questions. The full list of interview questions for each group of stakeholders is included in *Appendix 2*. The

overall structure of the interviews was basically the same, with four major areas: 1. Background information of the interviewee; 2. Perspectives on internationalization and related strategies and implementation; 3. Interviewees' personal experience – as a learner, as a teacher or as an administrator; and 4. Anything else the interviewees would like to share about internationalization at *KDU*.

As I was informed by literature (such as the study by Hyland et al. conducted in 2008) that the stakeholders' own definition on internationalization of higher education influences their perspectives, each interviewee was first asked to define in their own words what is meant by "Internationalization of Higher Education". Based on the definition provided, they were then asked to evaluate the level of internationalization at higher education institutions in Hong Kong, and especially at *KDU*, and also to give reason(s) for students to decide to attend the University for their undergraduate studies (for student interviewees, they were asked to give reason(s) for why *they* have chosen this University.)

In terms of strategies and implementation, each group of stakeholders was asked if they could identify the decision makers and administrators for internationalization strategies at the University, and if they have read any publications or documents about the strategies. Based on their knowledge and personal experience as a member of the University, interviewees were asked to evaluate the effectiveness of internationalization strategies implementation.

Then, interviewees were asked to share their own experience in teaching or learning, and whether they consider the learning environment is "internationalized" at *KDU*. Administrators were asked to comment on the teaching and learning

environment as well as their relationship with local and non-local students. Lastly, for students, they were asked whether they were "happy" with university life, while the faculty members and administrators were asked whether they thought students were "happy" with their university life. This question was set out to determine whether there was any dissatisfaction caused directly or indirectly by the internationalization strategies, as the literature review revealed that stakeholders' experiences about internationalization were not always positive. An open-ended question was asked at the end of each interview, in case interviewees wished to give any additional comments/suggestions related to the topic which was not covered previously. One student provided names of classmates whom she thought would be suitable to approach for an interview, and at the end, this "snowballing" effect (Punch 2009: 163) was successful in identifying one additional student interviewee.

According to May (2002: 211), new interviews are more likely to confirm earlier insights than to spark new discoveries. There is a good chance that as more interviews were done, a "theoretical saturation" can be reached, and a persuasive case can be made to others. I felt that over time, as the number of interviews accumulated, general patterns began to emerge out of individual "stories". Through analyzing the interviews and adding my own experience as "an actor in the drama", I have brought together collective experiences into developing the central themes in my study, which will be further discussed in Chapter 7.

vi. Pilot Study

Prior to carrying out actual interviews, a pilot study consisting of interviews with two students (one of them a recent graduate) and one staff member was conducted between July to August 2011. The purpose of the pilot study was to ensure the actual interviews would go smoothly, such as timing, use of tape recording device, as well as posing questions to the interviewees. According to May (2002: 210-211), early interviews provide the chance to discover unanticipated insights and findings, which could be used for necessary adjustment of the research focus and informing successive interviews. The analysis of data gathered from the pilot study was used to determine whether the interview questions needed any fine-tuning, or if further questions should be targeted towards a certain group of stakeholders. Therefore, the pilot study was important to me, as I was informed by the preliminary data analysis to adjust some of the questions, and I was better prepared for the actual interviews. The findings from the pilot study were written and submitted as one of the assignments for the module on "Learning and Teaching in the Global University" in October 2011.

vii. Data Analysis and Coding System

Before the actual analysis of data began, I had to first decide whether the analysis would take place before or after the entire data collection process was completed. This is called "analysis in the field" and "analysis after the field" according to Bogdan & Biklen (1998: 158). "Analysis in the field" is the method usually adopted by experienced fieldworkers; analysis is done concurrently with the data collection process and is more or less completed by the time all data have been gathered. On the other hand, "analysis after the field" means analysis would begin

after the data collection process is done. However, since reflection on findings is part of every qualitative study, qualitative researchers never follow "analysis after the field" in its pure form. For the purpose of this study, some analysis took place during the data collection process, such as thinking and making judgments, to ensure the data collected would be substantial enough for the full-fledged analysis afterwards.

"Analysis in the field", for this study, involved analyzing findings from the pilot study, which was completed in October 2011. The "good" and "bad" things arising from the pilot study were recorded, and my observations from the pilot study were used for planning of the actual data-collection process as mentioned in the previous section. During the actual data-collection process, I have made some "observer's comments" about ideas, hunches, and other important insights after an interview was done. This method was useful in identifying major themes arising from the data as the study progressed (Bogdan & Biklen 1998: 161).

"Analysis after the field" involved analyzing data collected from the actual interviews. Beside the "observer's comments" made during the "analysis in the field" process, interview transcripts were analyzed to identify "patterns" in the responses. For this part of the analysis, a coding system was developed for organizing and sorting the data. The entire set contained 39 codes, grouped under five major categories. First of all, the category of "setting / context codes" (total 17) was used for sorting the background information of interviewees, such as their ethnicity, local or non-local student status, teaching or study discipline, roles and responsibilities, years spent in the University, etc. For the responses from students, faculty, and administrators, four sets of codes were use for coding the transcripts: "definition of situation codes" (total: 3); "perspectives held by subjects codes" (total: 3); "subjects'

ways of thinking about people and objects codes" (total: 9); and "strategy codes" (total: 7).

According to Bogdan & Biklen (1998: 172-173), these codes are often used in organizing data on interviewees' world view, how they see themselves in relation to the setting/context, their ways of thinking towards particular aspects of the setting/context, their understanding of one another and of other objects in the setting/context. These codes were useful for answering the research questions on key stakeholders' perspectives, attitudes and interpretations about internationalization of higher education. For example, how they define the term and how they view the current situation ("definition of situation codes"); how they see the reason(s) for students to choose the University ("perspectives held by subjects codes"), their relationship with other stakeholders, and the issue(s) affecting students' "happiness" about university life ("subjects' ways of thinking about people and objects codes"). The last set of codes on "strategy" was added in order to understand the tactics, methods and techniques either used or experienced by the interviewees on internationalization strategies, and teaching and learning in an international classroom. The full set of interview codes is listed in *Appendix 3*.

After coding of interviews was completed, results from the analysis of data collected from interviews, as well as my own experience as "an actor in the drama" were combined to identify patterns of similarities and/or differences between the data and my own experience. Interviewees' background was also taken into consideration for possible correlation(s). Then, referring back to the literature, the findings were evaluated and analyzed to identify any "missing link(s)" between "ideals" formulated by the decision makers and "realities" faced by key stakeholders

in internationalization strategies implementation, as answers to the fourth research question in the study. Analysis of data collected from each group of stakeholders (students, faculty members and administrators) will be presented in the next three chapters (4 to 6), and my own experience will be discussed and compared with a summary of the findings in Chapter 7.

viii. Ethical Issues

There are several ethical issues which I as a researcher needed to address, which are related to the identity of the respondents, transcribing the interview responses, political agenda of the management, and the brand/image of the University.

Firstly, protecting the identity of the respondents is important. The names of the respondents may be easily identified, as they are the colleagues and students from the same University where I am currently working. Although they would have the right to remain anonymous, there is always a chance that their identities may be "leaked out" by accident. Therefore, I avoided conducting interviews in common areas (such as cafeterias) on campus, and interview transcripts were returned to the interviewees afterwards for verification and comments. Also, their names would not appear in the dissertation. However, I as a researcher would know the real identities of the interviewees, and I have to be sensitive and careful about this and to avoid possible "conflict of interest", such as having bias towards the views of the faculty/staff/students whom I have interviewed. As a qualitative researcher, I recognize my subjectivity as "an actor in the drama", and I have sought to be transparent about my views, beliefs and experiences, which means I will let my readers know what I think of the views of the interviewees, so that they can

understand the interpretations that I have made.

Further to being transparent about my views, I am also being a "reflexive" researcher, who acknowledges how my own positions and interests inform the process and outcomes of inquiry (Etherington 2004: 31-32). According to Trahar, it is still uncommon for researchers in the field of internationalization in higher education to reveal to their audience how their lives may have paralleled those of the respondents (2011: 45); however, as a member of staff working in the University which is the focus of my study, it was natural for me to be a "reflexive practitioner" and be open about my own history and experience. However, being a reflexive researcher without having an "open and ongoing relationship" with my respondents may lead to disagreement in what I have written about them in my dissertation, as suggested by Etherington (2004: 227). I hoped that by keeping interviewees anonymous in the dissertation and allowing them to make changes to the interview transcript would minimize this possible ethical issue. At the same time, I am also being an "insider" in this research. Although I may have many stories and anecdotes from my working experience, I do have to be mindful about sharing sensitive data/information, or inadvertently revealing the identity of the University through the stories and experience I shared.

Transcribing the interviews raised issues with language/translation. Out of the 15 interviews, five were conducted in English, one in Putonghua and the rest in Cantonese. Therefore, I had to translate interviews which were conducted in Putonghua or Cantonese into English during the transcription process. The translated version (as well as the ones originally conducted in English, so they were transcribed in English) was returned to the interviewees for verification and comments, but still, it

may be possible that the transcript did not carry verbatim the meaning/tone/attitude of the interviewees due to translation.

Lastly, I, as both a researcher of the study and a member of staff of the University, should also be careful that the study would not become "political ammunition". For example, faculty or administrators may use the findings from the study against their department heads or senior administrators, and vice-versa, in order to achieve some "hidden political agenda". In addition, potential conflict may arise between faculty and students from different ethnic backgrounds, as some of them may feel that they are being "discriminated" by the research findings. The University's senior administrators may also have concerns about how my study would affect the "brand name" or "image" of the University. In the case that the findings were not in favor of the University's effectiveness in internationalization strategy implementation, I, as a member of staff of the University, may face pressure from the administration to "amend" the findings, or, in the worst case, to "keep quiet", and not publish the findings. I do hope that this would not happen in an institution that boasts academic freedom and has no political affiliations with the government, but in order to be prepared for the worst case scenario, I have omitted the name of the University and used a pseudonym (*KDU*) in order to proceed with the study in a somewhat "anonymous" way. Also, I may need to seek consent from the University in the future, upon completion of my EdD degree, to publish my dissertation, as the "real identity" of the University may be known by the readers even though it has been omitted. I may decide not to publish my dissertation if I face a strong opposition from the University.

ix. Chapter Summary

In this chapter, I first described several paradigms in social science research, and provided justifications for choosing the *interpretivist paradigm* as informing the methodology of my research study. The strengths and limitations of the interpretivist paradigm and of a qualitative methodological approach were then further discussed. I have also provided a contextual background of the institution in my study (*KDU*), and outlined in detail the research approach, data collection by interviews with key stakeholders, the structure of the interviews conducted, and the coding method used in analyzing the transcripts. Lastly, I have discussed openly the possible ethical issues in this study and the ways I have taken to avoid or minimize issues with identity of the respondents, translation of the transcripts and potential conflict with the University.

(Blank page)

Chapter 4 – Data Analysis (Student Interviews)

i. Introduction

This Chapter presents the findings from data collected from five student interviews, which were conducted between March and April 2012. The interviews were recorded and transcribed, and the transcripts were then analyzed using a set of codes designed with an aim to extract data related to the research questions of the study, as discussed in the data analysis section (*Section vii*) of the previous Chapter.

The following is a summary of the findings discussed in each section of the Chapter, grouped together according to the codes under six major themes (for detailed description of the codes, please refer to *Section vii* in Chapter 3; for full list of codes, please refer to *Appendix 3*):

SCC-1-8 & SCC-16: Setting and Context

DSC-1 to DSC-3: Definition and Level of Internationalization in the University

PSC-1 to PSC-3: Reason(s) for Choosing KDU and How They Relate With Internationalization

POC-1 to POC-7: Relationship between Local/Non-Local Students & Faculty/Administrators

POC-9: What makes Students "Happy" about Life in University?

STC-1 to STC-7: Strategy of Internationalization – Students' Perspective

ii. Setting and Context (SCC-1-8 & SCC-16)

The five student interviews were conducted with two non-local and three local undergraduates from Science, Engineering and the Business School of *KDU*. Table 1 below summarizes the interviewees' ethnicities, high school and major:

Table 1: Profile of Student Interviewees

Student Code	Local / Non-Local	Ethnicity	High School	Major	Years in *KDU*
STU070	Non-Local	Mainland Chinese	Conventional	Biochemistry	0.5
STU080	Local	Hong Kong Chinese	International	Marketing & Management	3
STU100	Local	Hong Kong Chinese	Conventional	Chemistry	3
STU110	Local	Hong Kong Chinese	Conventional	Electronic Engineering	3
STU120	Non-Local	Korean	International	Chemical & Bioproduct Engineering	3

One point which was not shown in the above table, not all students received their high school education in their home town. The Korean student lived in Mainland China with her family and went to an international school in Guangzhou. She obtained an IB (International Baccalaureate) Diploma and was admitted to *KDU* based on her IB score. Of the three local students, two were educated in conventional schools ("conventional schools" refer to local high schools attended by the majority of local student.), and one studied in an international high school in Hong Kong. The Mainland student received her high school education in her hometown. It is important to find out where students received their secondary education, as this is reflected in the later analysis where I discuss how their background influenced their perspectives.

It can be argued that the local Business student (*STU080*) may also reflect a non-local Business student's perspective, as she spent her high school years in an international school environment. This perspective has been shown in her response and relationship with both local and non-local students and faculty.

Lastly, for the years spent in the university, four students spent 3 years, while one student had just completed her first semester at the time of the interview. Therefore, views from both new students and seniors were collected.

iii. Definition and Level of Internationalization in the University (DSC-1 to DSC-3)

When students were asked to define what is meant by "Internationalization of Higher Education" in their own words, the responses were diverse, each informed by their experience, as well as some prior knowledge in the subject. The following are the definitions provided by the students:

- "Internationalization relates to student composition, and students from different places can exchange ideas, live together and influence each other's way of thinking. Also, we learn from faculty members from around the world, and the international concepts and ideas they share with us in class." (*STU070*)

- "I would interpret it as something going international or something close to globalization but not so global yet...an increase in diversity of people from different backgrounds in terms of countries. I think internationalization should not always focus on Western beliefs." (*STU080*)

- "Having more foreigners to Hong Kong for exchange, and modeling the teaching style after some overseas practices, is part of what we call internationalization. If internationalization is defined by the number of exchange students, then I think [*KDU*] has done a good job." (*STU100*).

- "There should be students from three or more different countries studying in the university. The language used for communication should also be at least three, because Hong Kong itself is also a bilingual place with three spoken languages (Cantonese, Putonghua and English). The teaching content should also cover topics that are top standard in the world." (*STU110*)

- "I think it is something that makes people from different cultures know each other and understand other's culture." (*STU120*)

From the diverse responses above, I see general themes emerging on how "internationalization of higher education" is regarded by the students. First of all, the concepts of "exchange" and "understanding" are similar to Turner and Robson's notion of "reciprocal internationalization" (2008:20), as a way of developing an internationally-integrated campus and a "two-way or multi-directional flow of practices and influence" (Ibid). Also, student *STU080* mentioned "internationalization should not always focus on Western beliefs", which is in line with Turner and Robson's suggestion of "Westernization" (the privileging of any particular practices or values in an international setting) being "antithetical to reciprocity" (Ibid: 21).

Another general theme relates to "teaching practices". Three students, *STU070*, *STU100* and *STU110* mentioned about teaching, learning and content in their definitions, including "learning from faculty members from around the world and the international concepts and ideas they share with us" (*STU070*), "modeling the teaching style after some overseas practices" (*STU100*), and "the teaching content

should also cover topics that are top standard in the world" (*STU110*). These ideas are similar to Knight's definition of internationalization of higher education (2004: 11-12): "The process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education." However, from their responses, I see some students believe that an internationalized teaching and learning environment involves the modeling of overseas practices or top world standards, which is not the meaning of internationalizing the curriculum according to research consulted. For example, according to Hyland et al. (2008: 14), internationalizing the curriculum means "an international orientation in content, aimed at preparing students to perform in an international and multicultural context, and designed for domestic as well as foreign students." Interestingly, the three students who shared the same view are from Hong Kong and Mainland China, and their view is similar to Rui Yang's argument of China's *Jiegui* ("to connect tracks") policy since the early 1990s, as the need arises for China to be "connected" with the world and on par with "Western" standards in various aspects, including higher education (Yang 2002: 84). This "Chinese influence" is more evident when I look into how students' definitions are informed.

It is worth noting that one student (*STU100*) mentioned the "number of exchange students" and how *KDU* has done a good job in recruiting "more foreigners to Hong Kong for exchange." This is a view that is shared by administrators who were interviewed, which will be discussed in more detail in the data analysis for administrators in Chapter 6.

When students were asked how their definition was formulated, two students who have had more international exposure, *STU080* & *STU120*, were

informed by their secondary education experience. *STU080* who studied in an international high school in Hong Kong, said that her high school "had students from 85 countries in the world, and I enjoyed this experience so much that I hoped to extend this experience to university." She also expressed that "Hong Kong is special because of its historical background that a lot of people may not appreciate the Chinese development or the traditional Chinese culture, and there's still a lot of bias about it." This is similar to Kell & Vogl's observation that while the cultural commonalties with China are promoted since the return of sovereignty in 1997, many Hong Kongers are still reluctant to recognize Hong Kong's integration with Mainland China due to historical reasons or personal experiences (2012: 71). *STU120* had a similar high school experience, and one of the courses she took during her IB diploma was called "Third Culture Kid", which is designed for "students who have their own mother tongue (Korean) living in a different country (Mainland China) but studying in another language (English)." These are instances of student experiences not shared by locals from conventional secondary schools or Mainland students.

On the other hand, the three local/Mainland students' definitions were informed by their experiences in their university life and what they have "heard" from the media. Firstly, the Mainland student (*STU070*) learnt about internationalization as part of the "branding and economic development" from her homeland, as "Chinese people realize the benefits of internationalization", and "the level of English comprehension of Mainland Chinese is quickly rising." For the two local students, *STU110* "heard about this from time to time", and he heard "people talk about 'globalization' in economic terms, but academically I haven't heard about this term." He was mainly informed by the professional organization in his field (the "IEEE", or "The Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers"), which sets the standards in

the technological innovations and developments in the field. He believed that "an internationalized higher education institution should follow standards like these." The other local student, *STU100*, admitted that she did not fully understand the term, but she observed that "many exchange students are here, and when they are here, you will have some exchange with them." In addition to observations, her definition was also informed by social science electives she attended in the past.

Based on their definitions, students were asked to evaluate the level of 'internationalization' at the university. Overall, all students were positive about the level of internationalization at the university. They provided examples of meeting students from different countries in classes, statistics of over 10% non-local undergraduates studying full-time, and observations of a large number of international students on campus. However, the Mainland student (*STU070*) expressed the wish of seeing "more students from outside Hong Kong", as there are still "not many students from foreign countries." The Korean student (*STU120*) raised an interesting point about *KDU* being "very internationalized academically, but there is not enough personal interaction." Similarly, the local student in Science (*STU100*) observed a higher level of internationalization in the social science electives she attended, than the experience she had with her own major in Chemistry. The students' interaction with other students will be analyzed further in *Section iv*.

iv. Reason(s) for Choosing KDU and How They Relate with Internationalization (PSC-1 to PSC-3)

Students were asked about reason(s) for students to choose the university, reason(s) for themselves to choose the university, and whether their decision relates to internationalization. Knowing the reason(s) can help find out whether the university's

internationalization strategy has any effect on students' decision to study at the university.

For the possible reason(s) students chose the university, not all students provided an answer. The responses received were about Hong Kong's geographical location, its close proximity to China, bilingual environment, unique culture of East meets West, and also the university's global reputation and rankings and the quality of teaching faculty. As the responses from faculty and administrators to the same question are analyzed in the next two chapters, the analysis (in *Section iv*, Chapter 5 & *Section iv*, Chapter 6) will demonstrate whether all three groups of stakeholders share the same perspective on the reasons to study at the university.

As for the reason(s) each student interviewee chose the university, each one told a unique and interesting story. Their stories are summarized as follows:

- *STU070*: "I made the decision in a very short time as I only found out about the application deadline at the last minute. I wanted to have a chance to be interviewed so that I can find out what the admission interview is like for Hong Kong universities. I think studying in Hong Kong would be a new and challenging experience for me."

- *STU080*: "I chose [*KDU*] purely because of its School of Business...and also the entrance scholarship."

- *STU100*: "[*KDU*] has a good reputation, it's like a common sense to hear about [*KDU*]...I chose [*KDU*] because of the opportunities for exchange...because not all universities have these opportunities...I actually went on exchange last semester to Switzerland."

- *STU110*: "I chose [*KDU*] because of its academic research, and the reputation among the engineering field is quite high...The program

content is more professional."

- *STU120*: "Because of geographical advantage like, Hong Kong is half Western and half eastern culture, so the cultural diversity made me come to [*KDU*]."

When students were asked to what extent the level of internationalization of the institution had influenced their choice, not all students acknowledged that there was any direct influence, especially the local students. *STU080* said, "If I knew it (level of internationalization at the university) earlier, it would have re-confirmed my choice. I had several priorities in my mind, but if I knew it earlier, then I would 100% pick [*KDU*] at that time." *STU110* felt there was a "rather indirect relationship", as "part of [*KDU*]'s reputation is built on its success in internationalization, and also its professional program structure."

However, for the non-local students, the influence of their choice is based on the university's global recognition. *STU070* said, "[*KDU*]'s high ranking on the QS world university rankings was mentioned on TV all the time, and I got interested and wanted to find out more about the university on the internet." *STU120* also mentioned about "world ranking" and how that has influenced her choice. Administrators have also placed heavy emphasis on the university's global recognition in the internationalization strategy, as a way to attract more top students from around the world, and this will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 6.

v. Relationship between Local/Non-Local Students & Faculty/Administrators (POC-1 to POC-7)

Each interviewee was asked to share their experience in interacting with other students from different backgrounds. Again, the responses were diverse, and

each student seems to hold a unique "world view" depending on their own background and major of study. Their stories are described one by one in this section.

For *STU070*, she is a "Year 0" student who has just spent 1 semester at the university. The classes she attended so far were mostly for Mainland students also in "Year 0". She felt "there are still not many students from foreign countries, and therefore we have limited exchange with foreign students in class." She has joined the Student Union's Editorial Board, and met students from Hong Kong. Also, she has met a few foreign students from the dormitory, and another leadership training program in which she was participating.

My impression is that although her decision to study here has been influenced by the level of internationalization at the university, she was not offered an opportunity to immerse herself fully in an internationalized learning environment at the beginning of her studies, due to curriculum constraints for Year 0's.

For *STU080*, as mentioned before, she is a Business student from Hong Kong who has studied in an international high school. When asked if she has many friends/classmates from outside Hong Kong, she could easily name a mix of countries/nationalities of her friends, including Mainland, Indian, Korean, German, and other Europeans. She also has friends who are local students, and she regarded her unique background helpful in mingling with both local and non-local students. She had had a study abroad experience, but interestingly, she chose Peking University instead of other more popular destinations in Europe or North America. Her reflection of her exchange experience was, "I think students in Hong Kong love to go to Europe or North America for exchange, hoping to learn about all these Western cultures, but I

think it's also important to share your local culture/experience with other foreigners when you travel."

She also reflected on the fact that "Hong Kong is part of China right now, so instilling traditional Chinese culture...or Mainland students can be more active to erase all these biases is important." It was rather unexpected for me to hear that a student's international exposure had had such a profound influence on how she regards her own culture. Her experience showed that she has realized the objectives of internationalization of higher education, in particular, the concept of "Internationalization at Home" raised by the group of European scholars in 1999 (Crowther et al. 2000: 12), and I think she is well-prepared to perform in an international and multicultural context.

For *STU100*, as a Science major, her experience is vastly different from the Business major. She said that in class, "we only see Mainland students, rarely those from other places or with different backgrounds." On the other hand, she met more non-local students from the social science electives she attended, with "at least half of the classmates from different places." On a personal level, she admitted that there was little contact apart from class discussions. Her observation was that, "non-local students are friendly, but our interaction is limited to class time and in-class discussion, and we don't talk after class. I am not sure of the reason; perhaps it is hard to find a topic for chatting. When we met for the first time, we talked about our culture, but when we finished discussing about that, we ran out of topics to discuss."

She recalled the only personal interaction she had with a non-local student was with a Korean student from the US who was here for an exchange semester. She was introduced to this student by a friend who went on exchange to the US. They sometimes "talk to each other on Facebook", and she also "showed her around Hong Kong on weekends." It seems to me that she has enjoyed her exchange experience more than her interactions with non-local students at her home institution, even though there was "apparently less number of exchange students there (Switzerland)". This is a point worth reflecting, as EAIE has been actively advocating the idea of "Internationalization at Home" (IaH) since 2000, which is "any internationally related activity with the exception of outbound student and staff mobility" (Crowther et al. 2000: 6). However, *STU100*'s experience has not reinforced the IaH objective.

For *STU110*, his experience as an Engineering major is similar to the story told by the Science student above. He also met many students from Mainland in class, and also "students who lived in Hong Kong but do not speak Chinese", and Chinese who "immigrated to the US or UK when they were little." He emphasized that he had to "use English instead of my own native language" when talking to these students. He recalled his interactions with non-local students that have been restricted to classes or other structured/organized activities, and "we seldom have a chance to talk after lectures." He explained that, "unless the activities are compulsory, I don't have much chance to meet with international students...Usually, there is 'work' involved between our interactions, such as organizing activities. But for just chatting in leisure time with those who do not speak Cantonese, honestly there are not many occasions." In line with *STU110*'s experience, Turner and Robson dispute the conventional activity or training-based orientation towards institutional internationalization. They argue that these initiatives "may bring some initial benefits, but may ultimately confine action

within the frameworks of pre-existing local norms of practice rather than engendering the socially reflective learning and development that seems to be a prerequisite for long-term international sustainability" (2008: 125).

Lastly, for *STU120*, she actually shared a similar view as Turner and Robson about "confining internationalization initiatives within the local norms" from her experience. She said that "courses provide ways to interact with local and non-local students", but "in a cultural way, there is not much opportunity." An example she mentioned was the "O'camps", which are orientation camps organized by various student societies under the auspices of the Student Union, and usually participated in by local freshmen/women from early to mid-August. She wanted to join the 'O'camps, but unfortunately she was not informed about this opportunity, as the "local norm" is that non-local first years arrive in Hong Kong during late August, and they participate in another set of orientation activities especially designed for non-locals.

Nevertheless, she has enjoyed her friendship with classmates and friends, and she also has many friends who are from outside Hong Kong, from Malaysia, Indonesia, and Korea. Although from her experience, she would have welcomed the opportunity to meet more local friends during her 3 years' of study at *KDU*.

In terms of students' relationship with faculty members, firstly, it is important to study the relationship between local faculty and local students within the framework of internationalization because it shows whether local faculty's pedagogy is influenced by internationalization, and how it affects local students' learning. *STU070* and *STU100* both observed the need for local students to raise questions to

local faculty members after class in their mother tongue (Cantonese), as they usually speak up less in class when English is the medium of instruction. *STU080* provided a similar observation in marketing classes, when class participation counts for points. She said, "local students are not familiar with it, because some of them don't like to raise their hands and answer questions for the sake of earning points." These observations are somewhat in line with Li et al.'s findings about key factors that influence Chinese learners' performance in an educational environment (university) in the U.K. that is characterized by independent learning and less directed instruction, such as lower proficiency in English and a more passive learning strategy (2010: 393 & 402.)

As for the relationship between local faculty and non-local students, from the students' perspective, local faculty members are aware of students' diverse backgrounds. According to *STU070*, they have been nice to all students and do not treat them in different ways. She only recalled one local faculty who had used one or two Cantonese words during the lecture, but that did not affect her understanding of the main theme of the lecture. *STU100* recalled when faculty asked questions related to ethnic groups, they would invite students from different countries or ethnic groups to share their experience with others in class. *STU120* had a very positive experience when she was in her first year of study. Several local faculty members invited her and other non-local students for dinner, so that the students got to know each other.

For Non-local faculty and local students, *STU100* mentioned that in her major (Chemistry), "almost 90% of professors come from Mainland China, with some from other countries, with very few professors from Hong Kong." She did not feel greatly affected by the number of non-local faculty members, as they used English as

the language of communication. She was actually pleased to see so many non-local faculty, as she considered this a good example of *KDU*'s level of internationalization. On the other hand, *STU080* observed many non-local faculty from her major (Marketing) have been influenced by the "American teaching style", and as discussed, she did not think the local students appreciated this type of teaching style. Similarly, from non-local students' point of view (*STU070* and *STU120*), all faculty members, local or non-local, have been very nice to all students, and they did not feel they were treated in a different way from the local students.

The relationship between local/non-local faculty and students will be discussed again from the faculty members' point of view in the next chapter, when faculty members' perspectives on internationalization, teaching pedagogy and student diversity are further analyzed.

Lastly, for the relationship between administrators and students, none of the students mentioned about this in their responses. As the students did not mention "administrators" in their definition of internationalization of higher education, I think that students have not considered administrators as being part of the picture for "internationalization". In fact, administrators play an important role as driving forces behind the internationalization initiatives. How administrators see themselves in the "big picture" will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 6.

vi. What makes Students "Happy" about Life in University? (POC-9)

Towards the end of the interviews, students were asked to summarize their experience and to evaluate, "overall, are you 'happy' about life in [*KDU*]?" with an

aim to find out whether internationalization has contributed to students' level of "happiness" or otherwise.

All students responded positively and were happy about their university life. However, their "happiness" was not directly linked with the level of internationalization of the university. Here is a summary of their responses:

- *STU070*: "I think 'pressure' and 'motivation' can co-exist, though I am aware of how students say our university is a 'university of stress and tension'...I am happy about life here, I get to see Hong Kong's different places, not just the commercial/shopping districts...I get to go on hiking on weekends. I can also join many types of activities on campus, and so far it has been a challenging and fulfilling experience."

- *STU080*: "Very happy, because of the faculty, students, friends, opportunities, I would say. [*KDU*] emphasizes a lot not just on academic learning but also on career, mentorship, cohort, and all these activities for us to join."

- *STU100*: "I learn many different things in the past few years."

- *STU110*: "This is not easy to answer. When I have homework/projects and deadlines, I become 'unhappy', and during more relaxed times, I become 'happier'. I think this is the same cycle for everybody..."

- *STU120*: "I am quite satisfied here. I like the environment, the view, the faculty members are very nice, and I like my classmates and my friends here."

Just by comparing the five responses, apparently, what makes the non-local students (*STU070 & STU120*) "happy" is the environment, including the campus and Hong Kong's living environment. On the other hand, what makes the

local students (*STU080*, *STU100* & *STU110*) "happy" are achievements in learning and opportunities for preparation of future career. These are not directly linked to the level of internationalization of the university. I also asked the faculty and administrators the same question, and what these two groups of stakeholders think of students' "happiness" will be compared with the students' perspectives.

vii. Strategy of Internationalization – Students' Perspective (STC-1 to STC-7)

Students were asked questions about how much they know about the strategies in place for internationalization, and their perspectives on the effectiveness of these strategies. A total of seven "Strategy Codes" were used to analyze their responses, with an aim to find out the "reality" of how the strategies have been implemented in the eyes of one of the major stakeholder groups, the students.

Firstly, similar to the findings from the pilot interviews, students did not know much about who are the "decision makers" and "administrators" of the internationalization strategy at the university. The Mainland student (*STU070*) seemed more informed about this topic, as she named one of the Vice Presidents in charge of university development as one of the decision makers, and also knew the name of the office that has been helping international and Mainland students. She also mentioned a research institute which frequently invites faculty and scholars from outside Hong Kong for academic seminars and talks, although this is not directly linked with the university's internationalization strategy.

Another non-local student, *STU120*, mentioned the same office name in her response as well as another office in charge of academic records and registration.

The local business student (*STU080*) was more concerned about the marketing efforts, and she believed that "there should be a department that is responsible for branding...the school and should be working with some marketing agency or consulting firms that help to brand [*KDU*]."

Then, students were asked whether they have read any strategy documents published by the university, and how much they know about the university's internationalization strategy. None of the students had read any of the related publications. Their knowledge of the strategy mostly came from their own experience and/or observations.

Here are examples of their experiences and/or observations: They were all using English in class except for courses that specifically required students to know Cantonese; a student observed the university being "international in terms of having different students from different countries," and the majority of faculty members in her department was from outside Hong Kong (*STU080*); some appreciated the international course content in their social science electives (*STU070*, *STU080* & *STU100*); a couple of them participated in the university's study abroad program (*STU080* & *STU100*); a student participated in the "Student Ambassador" program and worked with other non-local students, through this program, he reckoned that "the reason for the university to promote internationalization is to enhance communication between different students (local, Mainland and international), and to have better academic linkage with overseas universities" (*STU110*); some have heard about the school's strategy in increasing the percentage of exchange students (*STU120*), or saw figures related to the international student numbers during "Open Days" or "Information Days" for prospective students and their parents (*STU080* & *STU110*).

Overall, the students' experiences and observations show that they only possess superficial knowledge on the university's internationalization strategy, which may be because they have not read any related publications. I asked the administrators for their views on whether they consider this as a problem or deficiency in the strategy implementation and their responses will be analyzed in the upcoming chapters.

The notion of "Internationalization at Home" (IaH) was not specifically asked during the interviews, but this code is used to determine whether the stakeholders, especially those from the local context (Hong Kong) were aware of any practices of IaH in place. Of the three local students (*STU080, STU100 & STU110*), *STU080* shared in detail about how the "exchange buddy" program has helped her to discover more about her own culture: "the school assigned me an exchange buddy from Shanghai Fudan University, hoping that my experience can help her and also I can find some ways to practice my Mandarin...I think it also helps me learn about other cultures, but also it helps me discover more about my own place. It happens to me a lot when all these exchange students ask me where to have all this local food or cheap places to shop, and some of them actually help me know more about this place (Hong Kong)."

STU100 compared her exchange experience in Switzerland and how she has definitely seen more exchange students from different nationalities in her home institution. She thought having non-local students is a good opportunity for her to practice English, She was also aware of the "exchange buddy" program but she did not sign up for it.

As mentioned previously, *STU110* signed up for another program called "Student Ambassadors". In this program, he had to communicate with students from outside Hong Kong and Mainland, and work with them to organize activities for the Engineering School. However, his relationship with fellow Student Ambassadors was only at "working level", as there is always "work" involved in their interactions.

When asked to evaluate the effectiveness of internationalization strategy implementation, each student told a unique story about their views. Overall, they remained positive about the strategy implementation, but also provided some areas or experience which they thought could be improved. *STU070* thought the strategy has been effective since "[*KDU*] attracted students from outside Hong Kong...and high quality of faculty from around the world." However, as a "Year 0" student, she has to enroll in a strict set of courses in mathematics, language, science and chemistry with other Year 0's, and she did not consider the content of these courses internationalized, apart from the fact that the courses are taught in English. As a Mainland student, she had to "put in extra efforts to study these terms (referring to special terminology in biology) after class", and "the use of English has been an obstacle for us to express our thoughts and ideas in class."

STU080 appreciated the "good mix of students from different countries", and she heard from her major department's professors that "they travelled to the States to interview future faculty members." She also enjoyed doing groupwork with exchange students in her group, as they can "inject some new ideas and perspectives that we often miss out because of geographical reasons." However, she pointed out that some faculty members may have a "hard time" managing an international classroom. Lastly, she raised a point about local students, "if they do not appreciate

their own culture in the first place, then I think it may be an area the School (business school) can work on."

The perspective held by student *STU100* saw the effectiveness being linked with the number of exchange students. She thought the university has done a good job in this regard, and she also appreciated the international course content in her social science electives. One example she quoted was a "comparative study with US, Japan and many other countries; it can be quite confusing but also interesting."

On the contrary, *STU110*, also a local student, had other observations. He said, "very often, I see international students hanging out with international students and they seem to have very good friendship...but there are not many opportunities beside the extra-curricular activities...International students seem to know everybody and easily bump into friends in canteens." He mentioned that for reasons unknown to him, the English language courses he was required to take had no international student enrolment, so "we can hardly see them in class." Nevertheless, he felt that his English has improved in the past 3 years of being in an English learning environment. Taking electives in business has helped him gain a "better idea on international standards and how Hong Kong can benchmark with these standards, as a reassurance that what we learn would be useful in our jobs upon graduation."

Lastly, *STU120* shared some similar views on how local and non-local students have been separated at times. She said, "there is kind of like a 'bubble' for non-local students and local students", an example was the "O-camp" she mentioned before. But she also agreed that the university was quite international, with a visible increase in exchange students she met in class.

From all of the above observations and comments, there are two major themes that emerge from the students' perspectives on the effectiveness of internationalization strategy implementation. First, there are decisions made by the management on how the curriculum is designed (for instance, strict requirements on courses for Year 0's and the grouping of local students in English language classes for Engineering students); however, from a student's point of view, these management decisions have limited their opportunity to meet other students from different backgrounds. Secondly, local students need a more active, or leading role in the internationalization strategy. Some of them, like *STU110*, are eager to "make friends" with non-local students, but they lack the skills to maintain a friendship outside the structured activities. Also, they are either not aware of the need for inclusion of non-local students, or are not being provided with such opportunities, when planning student activities such as "O'camp".

In order for "internationalization", or "internationalization at home" to be effective, local students' awareness and participation is as vital as ensuring a good population of non-local students in the home institution.

In terms of teaching and learning in an international classroom, these codes denote the strategies used and observed by stakeholders about teaching and learning in an international classroom. For the teaching medium, the use of English and how different students view or cope with this strategy has already been mentioned. Students with English as their second language may feel more at ease using their mother tongue in learning, but a student also reflected that the English learning environment has been "challenging" and "cannot be compared with studying in secondary school" (*STU070*).

Students also shared their experience and observations of the curriculum. For the four Science and Engineering majors, they expressed a general feeling that for their major courses, the theory and knowledge acquired was "similar everywhere", and the best way for them to be exposed to a more internationalized learning environment would be through elective courses. Some examples of what they learnt in the electives were "dictators in world history" (*STU070*), "poverty in different countries" (*STU100*), and "international standards taught in class, such as accounting/finance electives" (*STU110*). For the Business major (*STU080*), she learnt about a wide spectrum of companies from *Harvard Business Cases* used in class, and she said, "when professors use these cases, we learn more about different companies in different parts of the world."

Teaching approaches were also observed by students. First of all, group work was used frequently in business courses. *STU080* reflected that "there is always an exchange student in our group", either "professor assigned an exchange student", or "we voluntarily invite student to join us." She felt that "professors like to see diversity in our groups."

She also observed that faculty members acknowledged the different background of students by asking exchange students to share their point of view on a certain topic and "how does it really work in their countries." This observation was made by two other students as well, but one student reckoned that it "happens only in smaller classes. I don't think for classes that are taught in 'LTs' (Lecture Theatres), the professors would do the same" (*STU100*), and another said that it would "depend on the nature of the course, whether enrolment is limited to just our major students or open to others as elective" (*STU110*).

Generally speaking, *STU080* observed that "a lot of professors' teaching style is greatly influenced by their higher education...kind of American teaching style, which is very interactive and trying to engage students in participation." This approach has been well-received by exchange students, but some local students may not appreciate this style as much, especially when assessment is involved (i.e. when points are awarded for participation in class).

The case was different for the Science students, as they "seldom do projects together" and "communicate less with one another" (*STU100*). For Engineering students, the interaction was not through group projects, but through lab work (*STU120*), but they "seldom have a chance to talk (with classmates) after lectures." (*STU110*). Although there was less interaction, students still felt that they have been treated "equally" by the faculty members regardless of their background.

Concerning students' participation and interaction in class, a feeling was that "international students raise many questions and are more active in class discussion." (*STU070*). Another student felt that "when I talk to people from different cultures, I learn more...while talking to them, I learn different views..." (*STU120*). Another student expressed the wish to "have more opportunities to be in same classes with international students" (*STU110*).

The above observations and comments are similar to Jackson & Huddart's suggestions of hindrances to students' (especially home students') acceptance of internationalization, including language barriers, adaptation to varying communication styles, and differences in academic work attitudes (2010: 87). Students feel that having non-local students was beneficial to learning, but in reality,

they do need to put in extra effort in order to adjust to the teaching and learning environment.

Lastly, related to the issues of adjustment, *STU120* told an interesting story about her first year of study at the end of the interview. A problem occurred when she first started courses in chemical engineering, as she did not take Chemistry in high school. Therefore, during the holidays, she studied Chemistry and Physics on her own to help herself catch up. She also shared a story of a friend from Southeast Asia studying Mathematics, who had a problem catching up with course materials, because "he didn't take the Hong Kong education system." She commented, "university class is based on Hong Kong education system, right?", and suggested "the school can have a better understanding on other education systems and provide more fundamental courses or something." The Mainland student (*STU070*) had similar struggles with her biology class, as there are "many special terms in English which are hard to understand, and I have to put in extra efforts to study these terms after class."

Ippolito suggests factors that create barriers to intercultural learning, one of the factors is "privileged knowledge" (2007:760). In this case, without being aware, local (or home) students claimed superior knowledge over non-local students, and there was a lack of peer learning when *STU070*, *STU120* and her friend were struggling with their progress in course work.

In subsequent chapters, I will analyze the responses from faculty and administrators to illustrate whether they were aware of these issues, and whether they have done anything about the issues in their capacity.

viii. Chapter Summary

This Chapter presented the findings from five student interviews conducted in this study. Each student provided his/her own definition of the term "internationalization of higher education" and commented on the current level of internationalization at *KDU*. It is interesting to note that, depending on their background, students' perspectives varied on what makes a university "internationalized". Nevertheless, both local and non-local students agreed generally that the major attractions to students to *KDU* were geographical proximity to Mainland China and the high rankings of the university itself in global university league tables.

Those who have previously been exposed to intercultural learning environments during their secondary school education, either locally or outside Hong Kong, seemed to appreciate the opportunities to integrate with those from different backgrounds more than those who were brought up in a less diverse environment. However, these students may also struggle at first with the "local curriculum", especially in science subjects. Local students educated in "conventional secondary schools", albeit being excited about cultural immersions through exchange/study abroad programs, were less prepared, or not possessing the skills or language ability in being a "good host" to non-local students studying in their home university, beside structured or organized activities such as group work in class or student ambassador / exchange buddy program.

Chapter 5 – Data Analysis (Faculty Interviews)

i. Introduction

This Chapter presents the findings from data collected from five faculty interviews, which were conducted between December 2011 and January 2012. Similar to the student interviews, the faculty interviews were recorded, transcribed, and then analyzed using a set of codes, as illustrated in the research methodology (Chapter 3), designed with an aim to extract data related to the research questions of the study.

The following is a summary of the findings discussed in each section of the Chapter, grouped together according to the codes under six major themes (for detailed description of the codes, please refer to *Section vii* in Chapter 3; for full list of codes, please refer to *Appendix 3*):

SCC-1, 9-12 & 16-1 : Setting and Context

DSC-1 & 3: Definition and Level of Internationalization in the University

PSC-1 & 3: Reason(s) for Students to Choose KDU and How They Relate With Internationalization

POC-2-5 & 8: Relationship between Local/Non-Local Faculty & Students/Administrators

POC-1 & 9: Faculty's Observations about Student Interactions and What makes Students "Happy" about Life in University?

STC-1-7: Strategy of Internationalization – Faculty's Perspective

ii. Setting and Context (SCC-1, 9-12 & 16-17)

The five faculty interviews were conducted with two non-local and three local faculty members from four Schools of *KDU*: Science, Engineering, Business, and Humanities & Social Science. Table 2 below summarizes the interviewees' background:

Table 2: Profile of Faculty Interviewees

Faculty Code	Local / Non-Local	Ethnicity	School	Years in *KDU*	Gender	Rank*
FAC010	Local	Hong Kong Chinese	Science	3	Male	Asst Prof
FAC020	Local	Hong Kong Chinese	Humanities & Social Science	4	Male	Asst Prof
FAC030	Local	Hong Kong Chinese	Engineering	10.5	Male	Asso Prof
FAC040	Non-Local	Jewish American	Humanities & Social Science	18	Male	Asso Prof
FAC050	Non-Local	Mainland Chinese	Business	3.5	Female	Asst Prof

** Asst Prof: Assistant Professor; Asso Prof = Associate Professor*

Regarding the relationship between the gender and rank of the interviewees and the responses they have given, firstly, in terms of gender, there was not any noticeable influence according to my observations during the interviews and the subsequent process of transcription and coding. The University has a long-standing policy on anti-discrimination, and has set up a Committee to conduct a periodic review of such policy. Complaints of grievances that were brought to the University President's level were being handled by ad hoc committees to investigate those cases. I believe the University has put in a lot of effort in providing a working environment that gives equal opportunity for all staff.

In terms of the rank of the interviewees, all five faculty members are holding positions between Assistant Professor and Associate Professor, which are in the middle to upper position of a teaching faculty's career path at *KDU* (the positions below "Assistant Professor" are "Lecturers" and "Instructors", which do not have research duties; the positions above "Associate Professor" are "Professor" and "Chair Professor", with "Chair Professor" appointed by nomination, and carrying named professorship titles funded by outside donors such as local/international corporations or charitable organizations.)

At their level, these five faculty members are mostly involved in research and teaching, as well as some additional administrative duties related to undergraduate and/or postgraduate program coordination, curriculum development, and also departmental and school committees. When faculty members were asked to describe their roles and responsibility in the University, all of them answered "research and teaching" as their major responsibilities, and three of them were also serving on departmental and school committees, as well as contributing to new curriculum and program development within their department. It was observed in a number of responses, that even though these faculty members were involved in many aspects of curriculum and program administration, they did not perceive themselves as a "decision maker", as they believed that decisions have always been made by those "up there", referring to those higher in rank than themselves. I think their ranking has influenced how they responded about their perspectives on internationalization strategy implementation at KDU, which are explained in more detail under *Section vii* of this Chapter, as well as the summary and discussion of findings in Chapter 7.

When describing their background, four faculty members also mentioned their education. Three of them received their PhDs in the US, while one of the faculty members from Hong Kong received his PhD from a local university. Analysis will show that their local and/or overseas education and teaching experiences have influenced their perspective on internationalization of higher education.

iii. Definition and Level of Internationalization in the University (DSC-1 & 3)

Faculty members were asked the same question as students and administrators, to define what is meant by "Internationalization of Higher Education" in their own words. Some were not familiar with the term, while a number of them were able to critique the "local" definition of internationalization. The following is a summary of the definitions provided by the faculty members:

- "The term itself is a bit hard to define, as we consider 'non-local' students from outside HK as 'international students' here, but there are a lot of students coming from Mainland China as well...I am not sure if we should consider those from Mainland China as 'international students'; I think it would be better to consider the diversity of student backgrounds." (*FAC010*)

- "There are two sides to the definition. On the one hand, there's the student composition and number of non-local students. On the other hand, there's the collaboration and exchange with institutions abroad. In addition, there's the faculty composition and whether the university is recruiting faculty from around the world. There is one point I noticed that when we talk about the 'non-local' students, many of them came from Mainland China." (*FAC020*)

- "The campus should have students from different places and different ethnic backgrounds. Teaching faculty should be internationalized. Other than ethnicity, people's perspectives, mindset and culture

should be diversified to create an internationalized campus. University, by definition, should be an international place." (*FAC030*).

- "Internationalization of higher education typically consists of an outlook on education principles and methods, which makes use of experiences of other places in the world and applies them to Hong Kong. Secondly, it involves the internationalization of faculty, administration and student body...Today, there is probably wider internationalization than there was in the colonial era...With Hong Kong, the definition has been a bit ambiguous, because it is part of China. If people came from the Mainland, is that internationalization or is that simply nationalization of Hong Kong's educational system? I think one should be careful not to confuse 'internationalization' with 'Westernization'." (*FAC040*)

- "I'm not sure how to define internationalization of higher education. If I have to interpret it, it is how to educate the students so that their thinking is more global and prepare them in a way so that they can work in an international/global environment." (*FAC050*)

Compared with students, faculty members seemed to be more knowledgeable about the local context of internationalization. Also, their definitions were in line with Knight's concept of integrating a global dimension into the functions or delivery of higher education (2004: 11-12). Interestingly, three of them reflected on the local policy of including "Mainland students" in the statistics of "non-local students". In the study by S. W. Ng, the majority of non-local students are from Mainland China, and he argues that there is an urgency to attract students from other countries for the purpose of internationalizing higher education in Hong Kong (2012: 3). Ng quotes an example of how one local university's "Global MBA Raking" has dropped four places this year, due to the fact that faculty and students from Mainland China were no longer included in the internationalization assessment criteria (Ibid).

Similar to one of the students' views, *FAC040* "warned" about how "internationalization" has been confused with "Westernization". Although, according to him, internationalization involved making use of experiences of other places in the world, he added at the end of the interview that "internationalization" has been viewed by a lot of people in a restrictive way, in terms of "Western countries" and "pretty much everything else is ignored." This idea resonates with Turner and Robson's suggestion that the privileging of any particular practices or values in an international setting is antithetical to "reciprocal internationalization" (2008:21).

In their definitions, faculty members did not explicitly mention internationalizing the curriculum, except one faculty (*FAC050*) included in her definition about preparing students to think in a more "global" way, so that they can work in an international/global environment. One possible explanation might be that some faculty members, especially those from Science and Engineering, felt that they have already been teaching "universal" concepts and theories in their discipline. This will be further discussed in *Section vii* regarding faculty members' perspectives on the internationalization strategy.

Based on their definitions, faculty members then evaluated the level of internationalization at the University. Mixed feedback was received. Among the more positive feedback, *FAC050* commented on her School's (Business) level of internationalization, with "very diverse faculty from different countries" and "a diverse student body." *FAC040* said that "compared to other Hong Kong universities, this is probably the most internationalized University; at least the statistics I've seen have indicated that's so." He gave examples of "a majority of the faculty here has international experience", and "even a few people in the administration were brought

in internationally." Also, the University has "a substantial amount of international students."

FAC030's response was more neutral. In the past few years, he has seen "more and more exchange students and full time students from outside Hong Kong & Mainland", but compared to his overseas study experience, the campuses there were "really international with people from around the world", but, "in [*KDU*], the majority student ethnicity is still Chinese."

Lastly, *FAC010* and *FAC020* were more conservative about the level of internationalization in the University. *FAC010* said he did not "like this kind of internationalization", because "it seems we are only admitting more students from Mainland China." He would like to see "more diversity in terms of country of origin among our 'non-local' students instead of just the overall percentage of 'non-local' students we have." Similarly, *FAC020* mentioned something he has read in the news about non-Chinese exchange students' dissatisfaction on the level of internationalization of higher education institutions in Hong Kong. He also wanted to see more diversity in the student composition. On the other hand, he thought the University has done a better job in developing teaching programs in collaboration with overseas universities, and he mentioned a program from his School (Humanities and Social Science) offered in collaboration with universities in China and the US.

iv. Reason(s) for Students to choose KDU and How They Relate with Internationalization (PSC-1 & 3)

Faculty members were asked to comment on what they thought were the reasons for students deciding to attend this University for their undergraduate studies,

and whether the level of internationalization of the institution would have influenced students' choices. Their responses are summarized below and compared with the reasons provided by students.

Four out of five faculty members provided "China" or "Gateway to China" as the main reason for students to choose to study here. Also, with Hong Kong itself being an "international city", according to *FAC030*, the city's "Western influence" would be a major attraction to students who were used to a "Western" or "Americanized" lifestyle. *FAC010* and *FAC020* also shared the same view. *FAC040* raised another point that "things in Hong Kong operate fairly openly is also a big draw", referring to access to information for academic work and research. The faculty member from Mainland China, *FAC050*, did not mention "China" as the reason for students to choose to study in Hong Kong; rather, she emphasized the "global focus" of Hong Kong's undergraduate education, as "almost everyone would ask about our exchange program." She regarded opportunity for exchange as "very important for students from Mainland China". The faculty members' responses were similar to the reasons provided by students.

Then, faculty members were asked to what extent the level of internationalization of the institution influenced students' choices. Three of them mentioned about the language of instruction, as the use of English as the teaching medium would definitely reduce the language barrier for students from outside Hong Kong. *FAC030* stressed on the University's reputation and rankings, that "have been rising in the past few years", which would be attractive to students. Again, *FAC050* reiterated her view that "our global/international focus is definitely one of the strongest selling points." These views corroborated with the two non-local students'

(*STU070 & STU120*) responses to the same question; however, further analysis of faculty members' evaluation of the University's internationalization strategy will show that the language of instruction has significantly affected local students' learning in the classroom.

v. *Relationship between Local/Non-Local Faculty & Students/Administrators (POC-2-5 & 8)*

Faculty members were asked to share their experience in interacting with local and non-local students. Firstly, the three local faculty members' experiences are discussed. They all mentioned that they have students from outside Hong Kong and China in their classes, but there were not that many. The Science faculty (*FAC010*) said that he has noticed there have been more Koreans in his class this semester, and he also knew some Indian and European. He heard that "we" (referring to his Department) admitted a student from Bangladesh, but he hasn't actually met the student. The Social Science faculty (*FAC020*) said he has met students from Northern Europe and North American, but not that many. A similar response was given by the Engineering faculty (*FAC030*), he said the ratio of non-local students is not high; he has also met a few Korean students and Mexicans in his classes.

In terms of their interaction with local students, two of them observed that local students often came up to them after class or during break time and asked questions. *FAC010*, who was educated abroad, said "I may talk too fast in English and Hong Kong students will come and ask me questions during the break. I will use Cantonese only if the entire group is from Hong Kong and can understand Cantonese." They were under the impression that local students were reluctant to use English to raise questions in class or participate in discussions.

On the other hand, *FAC020* was impressed with Mainland Chinese students' language ability and observed they were more proactive and asked more questions in class. Although non-local students generally have better English fluency, *FAC030* said not all students have the same level of motivation for learning. He mentioned one example of an exchange student from the US in his class, whom he felt had spent more time travelling than studying.

For the non-local faculty members, *FAC050* mentioned that she was not quite sure "who are from Hong Kong and who are from Mainland China" in her classes, but every year there were non-local, non-Chinese students in her classes. *FAC040*, who has been working in the University for the longest period among faculty members who were interviewed (18 years), has a lot of experience in interacting with students from different backgrounds. He observed the majority in class have always been the local students, but many Mainland Chinese and international students took his class as well. With the influx of Mainland students, *FAC040* noticed that "the ability of students to understand (English) had been augmented, because actually their comprehension is better than the Hong Kong students, ironically enough, Mainland was never a colony of Britain." Students from Mainland China, *FAC040* commented, were "just very accomplished and good in English".

However, *FAC040* was somewhat disappointed by other non-local students from outside of Mainland China. His views were similar to *FAC030*, that even though this group of students did not have to cope with a language barrier, a lot of them "spend a lot of time partying, making trips around Asia, even in the middle of the semester, and they don't have to work nearly as hard as the local and Mainland students." This group of students did contribute actively in class, but he was not

satisfied with the quality of their contributions, as he said, often these students spoke up "about things that they have no understanding of, just to hear their own voice."

The above observations and interactions show that students from different backgrounds do have diverse abilities, living/learning patterns as well as aspirations in their university life. Apparently, local students have been somewhat disadvantaged by the use of English in class, as well as the influx of high caliber Mainland Chinese students. On the contrary, other "non-local" students from outside of Mainland China may have devoted more of their efforts in activities outside of class, which, in the first place, were the main attraction for them to study in Hong Kong. It is anticipated that these differences will pose difficulties for faculty members in terms of teaching in an international classroom, and this will be further discussed in *Section vii.*

Lastly, from faculty members' responses, there were only a couple of instances where they mentioned about their interaction with administrators on matters related to internationalization. *FAC010* said some data on non-local students was distributed at a recently held School Board Meeting. *FAC020* mentioned that he has taken up an administrative role related to a new undergraduate major program offered by his School. He was unsure about his duties at that point, but he said he may "need to help in the recruitment and screening/interviewing of non-local students."

vi. Faculty's Observations about Student Interactions and What makes Students "Happy" about Life in University? (POC-1 & 9)

During the student interviews, they were asked to describe their relationship with students from different backgrounds. Faculty members were not asked the same question; unexpectedly, in their responses, they have also provided

some observations about student interactions. On the other hand, faculty members were asked whether they thought students were "happy" about life in [*KDU*].

In terms of faculty members' observations about student interactions, these were quite similar to what the student interviewees have experienced, especially the locals educated in "conventional" secondary schools. One common observation was the "segregation" of different student groups – locals, Mainland Chinese, and other "non-locals". *FAC010* said, "Basically they (locals) don't have much passion/motivation to interact with the non-locals." He heard from some local students that learning with Mainland students was a "challenging experience", because Mainland students were "hard working and get all the good grades". Moreover, local students felt they have "less priority over hall spaces than non-locals", so they were not only "disadvantaged" in terms of learning but also their campus life. Nevertheless, *FAC010* believed that local students should try to learn from the strengths of non-local students, such as presentation and communication skills in group work or presentations.

FAC020, who said earlier that local students seemed reluctant to speak in English in class, commented that local students preferred to be with those from the same background because they "didn't want to speak English." If a class did not involve group work, then the learning experience would be "quite separated" as "they don't need to talk to students in other groups for the entire semester." He provided a possible explanation to this phenomenon, that is "we seldom explain why we have students from outside Hong Kong in class, and that's why students behave in the ways I mentioned."

Similar comments were made by *FAC030*, and his view was that "those from outside Hong Kong, being the minority, tend to stick together as a group." Coincidentally, both *FAC030* and *FAC040* had the same observation of seeing students "hanging around in their own groups" and "speaking their own language". However, *FAC030* encouraged local students to try and experience a new learning environment with more non-local students, because "they were already among local peers during their high school years, if they only see the same peers in university, then university life would just be like an extension to their high school life." *FAC040* remained unsure of whether local students would mix with those from outside Hong Kong. On the contrary, *FAC050* observed in her class that even though exchange students tend to form their own groups, there were times that they mix with others, and it would depend on whether they "reach out and want to join the local group."

As to the question of whether students were "happy" about their university life, generally, faculty members did not relate this to the level of internationalization at the university. Rather, a number of them related students' happiness with pressure from their studies. *FAC010* and *FAC020* both observed that those who perform very well academically, especially Mainland Chinese students, faced a lot of stress mentally and often "stay in the dormitory for studying." *FAC040* reflected that "those students over the years that I have been here who were under the 3-year undergraduate education do have a lot of work to do." The three of them all believed that the "international students" (from outside Hong Kong and Mainland China) should be happier, as their objective of studying here was to immerse themselves in the local culture and to travel around China and Asia, instead of make the grade. *FAC030* believed students may still be "happy" if they stay in their own groups without interacting with others, but then we would not see a truly

"internationalized" campus. Lastly, *FAC050* was not sure whether students were "happy" so she did not comment on this question.

The findings from faculty members' responses show that they are also aware of issues of student integration and stress. Academic and time pressure, according to Ippolito's study, is one of four factors that emerged as barriers to intercultural learning (2007: 757-760). When faced with deadlines and pressure, given the choice, many learners will choose to work with "co-nationals", as previously successful strategies adopted to relieve pressure were not relevant in a multicultural context (Ibid: 756). The language barrier also made communication slower, and some students simply lack interest in learning about other cultures, similar to what *FAC010* and *FAC020* observed among some of the local students. As Sheridan also suggests, "changing habitus is a lengthy process, but in a globalized context, home students should expect to work in increasingly diverse environment and be more inclusive to those who speak another language." (2011: 138)

vii. Strategy of Internationalization – Faculty's Perspective (STC-1-7)

Faculty members were asked about their knowledge of the strategies in place for internationalization, and their perspectives on the effectiveness of these strategies. Their responses were analyzed to find out how the strategies have been implemented in the eyes of faculty members.

Firstly, when asked whether they knew who were the "decision makers" and "administrators" of internationalization strategy at the university, faculty members had a general impression that decisions were made at the senior

management level, including Deans, Provost and the President. They also believed their School's office and offices related to international student affairs were involved in the decision making process. Two of the faculty members said they often heard decisions were made "up there" or "from the sixth floor" (location of the senior administrator's offices) but were not sure exactly who made those decisions. None of the faculty members reckoned they had a role in the decision making process for internalization strategies.

As for the administrators to implement the strategy, faculty members provided several different answers, including "colleagues from our department", "the School", "the unit involved in international student affairs", "global student office", "dean of undergraduate education", "foreign affairs office", and "different offices that support exchange students, undergraduates". Overall, faculty members were able to name more offices related to internationalization strategies formulation and implementation, but they were also not sure whether their answer was correct.

Similar to the students, faculty members have not read any strategy documents published by the University. They believed that the information would be available from the University's website, or their Department/School office. One faculty member recalled "I do remember hearing the President saying something about it."

Then, faculty members were asked how much they knew about the University's internationalization strategy and for their evaluation of the effectiveness of strategy implementation. From the observable outcome, such as the increased number of non-local students on campus, faculty members believed to some extent

that the strategies have been implemented effectively. For instance, *FAC050* was quite satisfied, outcome-wise, with the level of internationalization at her School (Business). However, several faculty members were questioning the benefits of internationalization, especially to the local students. The following is a summary of their concerns.

FAC010 said, "Our department has recruited quite a number of non-local students from Mainland China, but it is hard to say if this strategy is right or wrong, because admission is based on academic results...If the university wants to admit students with more diversified backgrounds then it is not totally effective, because we have used a lot of efforts to recruit students from Mainland China...the university should think of ways to attract more 'non-local' students not coming from Mainland China." He compared *KDU* with his experience of studying and teaching in US universities and commented that "in the US, there is no issue of 'internationalization' in universities, but they are rather more focused on admitting students with diversified backgrounds, such as different ethnic groups and physical abilities."

FAC020 held similar views. In his administrative role in the new undergraduate major program offered by his School, he was not sure whether there was a strategy in place to recruit more non-local students, but he believed that in the long run, it would be worthwhile to formulate such strategies. However, at the university level, he felt there was still a "big question about 'internationalization' and 'mainlandization'." Based on his teaching experience at undergraduate and postgraduate level, the majority of the non-local students came from Mainland China, and he was not sure if they were also included as "non-local students", whether this would consume resources allocated in recruiting students who are "international". At

the end of the interview, he reiterated his concerns about local students being left out of the picture of internationalization. He said, "I know many students question internationalization, in practical issues such as hall spaces, group work in class, use of English, etc...universities keep admitting more and more non-local students, but on the other hand, I am not sure how much work has been done to convince the local students about the benefits...maximizing the learning experience would require local students to be convinced of the benefits."

FAC030 believed the regular overseas and Mainland visits to recruit students have been effective, but he expressed that although "the end result is there, I am not sure if it is directly related to the strategy." He raised another perspective on the importance of increasing awareness among faculty members about the internationalization strategy: "Decision makers should arrange meetings in departments to introduce the strategy and to take a more proactive role in communicating with faculty members...emails and documents may not be the most effective way in communicating the strategy." This view is similar to Dewey and Duff's suggestion of "individual-institutional partnership" in implementing internationalization strategies, as "there must be mutual understanding of institutional goals, rationales and objectives of comprehensive internationalization" (2009: 503). Having been educated in the US, *FAC030* also commented that "there is still a significant distance between the level of internationalization I have experienced in US universities and in Hong Kong...more casual ways such as organizing cultural activities or other things that students like to do together may be more effective for students to mix together." He added that relevant policies and regulations should be in place to avoid unnecessary conflicts between different student groups over resources such as hall space and other facilities. Nevertheless, he remained positive that

"gradually in time, the university could achieve more in terms of internationalization."

FAC040, who "warned" about confusing "internationalization" with "Westernization" earlier, commented that "as long as it is pegged at that level, that is to 'copy' after the United States, it's far from fulfilling internationalization." For example, he mentioned that currently there has been "little interaction apart from the developed countries", and for places such as Southeast Asia, Africa, Latin America, there has been "almost total neglect" in terms of recruiting students to study in Hong Kong. He quoted an incident that happened around 5-6 years ago, when he was asked to check by a colleague from another local university about the number of African students on campus, and there were none at that time. He felt a bit "embarrassed" by that, and he believed these students would be more "long term prospects for us" than students from developed countries, as "people from developing countries see it as one of the really fundamental options to study and work in China." These comments show that faculty members do have thoughts and input on the University's internationalization strategies, but it is not certain whether the administration has collected and reviewed faculty members' input systematically.

Lastly, faculty members were asked to comment on the level of internationalization in the course content, and whether they felt the teaching faculty members were aware of students' different background and have they done anything to accommodate these differences. Interestingly, all faculty members, local and non-local alike, agreed that the most accommodating adjustment to their teaching has been the use of English as medium of instruction. In terms of teaching content, faculty members from different disciplines held diverse views. For Science and Engineering

faculty (*FAC010* & *FAC030*), they did not consider there was much room for internationalized content for the theories taught in class, and the knowledge they convey already could be used anywhere in the world. According to Maureen Bell's (2004: 53) "spectrum of acceptance" of internationalizing the curriculum, their views belong to "Level 2" of the spectrum, where "internationalization was seen as inappropriate for a variety of reasons", such as, the disciplines were taught as pure theory, the "facts" were "international" by definition, and the over-riding importance of "covering the curriculum" over internationalization.

On the other hand, Social Science and Business faculty members (*FAC020*, *FAC040* & *FAC050*) have been more aware of including internationalized teaching content in the curriculum. *FAC020* used examples of current affairs from around the world, and he would explain the background to students to make sure everyone understood the context. *FAC040*, who has taught international law, would use textbooks in both English and Chinese with identical subjects to show students that this subject has "pretty much been taught the same way in many countries in the world." *FAC050* used a lot of teaching materials from *Harvard Business Cases*, which have been widely used in other countries, as well as examples from around the world. In order to balance the use of examples from both Hong Kong/Asia and North America/Europe, she occasionally used examples of Chinese commercials, and she translated the content beforehand to make sure everyone understood.

A number of faculty members also shared their observations on students' classroom learning. Again, several of them were concerned about local students' ability to learn in an "international classroom". *FAC040* said, "My experience is the same as a lot of other people's, that is, many of the students cannot understand most

of what I say in class." Although he agreed that internationalization has been beneficial to undergraduates to learn in English and have more advantage of future postgraduate studies, he used the term "stranded" to describe the situation of many local students, as they did not understand a lot of what went on in courses.

This problem was less serious for Science majors; rather, the difficulty was in students' ability to understand concepts behind the theories. *FAC010* noticed there was clearly a disparity in learning ability among students from different backgrounds, and those who were not as strong in the subject would have the impression that "the good grades were always taken by Mainland students." When there was group work involved, *FAC020* observed another issue of students choosing to work with those from the same background, and discussing in their mother tongue. Although the group formation did not affect his teaching, he wanted to see students working in a team with members from different backgrounds, especially for courses related to culture, politics and regional studies. He tried once with assigned groupings in a postgraduate course he taught but has not yet employed this method in the undergraduate courses. He realized that faculty's supervision and interaction were also important to facilitate an internationalized learning experience, to relieve the stress and uncertainties for students, such as when they needed to work in assigned groups.

There were faculty members who remained positive about students' learning experience in an international classroom. *FAC030* preferred to have more international students in his class, and he generally appreciated their motivation for learning. Overall, he felt that having students from outside Hong Kong in class would have an "uplifting effect on the overall learning atmosphere." This impression was also shared by *FAC050*; as she has been teaching final year students in her department,

she was quite satisfied with the level of English ability of students from different backgrounds. She often assigned group work and she did not see any downside from the international experience which her students have been exposed to in class. She observed that non-local students would speak up more in class, but she regarded this as "mutually beneficial", as "they bring different perspectives to class discussion."

viii. Chapter Summary

In this Chapter, analysis from five faculty member interviews was presented. Overall, their definitions on "internationalization of higher education" were more comprehensive than the answers provided by students. Several faculty members expressed concerns about the ambiguity between "internationalization" and "Westernization" in Hong Kong's context, and questioned about the policy of including "Mainland Chinese students" in non-local student admission schemes. They were aware of the diverse backgrounds in class, and have tried to incorporate relevant teaching strategies, such as group work and cross-cultural case studies or teaching materials. However, faculty members' feelings were mixed in terms of whether local students could benefit from the effects of an internationalized curriculum and campus environment, as many of the faculty members were not satisfied with local students' English language ability and their indifferent attitude towards non-local students.

(Blank page)

Chapter 6 – Data Analysis (Administrator Interviews)

i. Introduction

This Chapter presents the findings from data collected from interviews with five administrators, which were conducted between February and June 2012. Similar to the student and faculty interviews, the administrator interviews were recorded, transcribed, and then analyzed using a set of codes as illustrated in the research methodology.

The following is a summary of the findings discussed in each section of the Chapter, grouped together according to the codes under six major themes (for detailed description of the codes, please refer to *Section vii* in Chapter 3; for full list of codes, please refer to *Appendix 3*):

SCC-1, 11, 13-14, 16-17: Setting and Context

DSC-1 & 3: Definition and Level of Internationalization in the University

PSC-1 & 3: Reason(s) for Students to Choose KDU and How They Relate With Internationalization

POC-2-8: Relationship between Administrators, Faculty & Local / Non-Local Students

POC-1 & 9: Administrators' Observations about Student Interactions and What makes Students "Happy" about Life in University?

STC-1-7: Strategy of Internationalization – Administrators' Perspective

ii. Setting and Context (SCC-1, 11, 13-14, 16-17)

The five administrator interviews were conducted with four local administrators and one non-local administrator, who are involved in student affairs and student recruitment. Table 3 below summarizes the interviewees' background:

Table 3: Profile of Administrator Interviewees

Admin. Code	Local / Non-Local	Ethnicity	Work Area	Years in *KDU*	Gender	Rank*
ADMIN060	Local	Chinese	Previously a faculty member in Business School; currently the Dean of Students.	20	Male	Dean
ADMIN090	Local	Chinese	Exchange program administrator in Science School.	1.5	Female	EO
ADMIN130	Local	Chinese	Administrator of local undergraduate recruitment and admissions.	1.5	Male	EO
ADMIN140	Local	Chinese	Manager of international undergraduate recruitment and admissions.	6	Female	Manager
ADMIN150	Non-Local	Half-Chinese, Half-Canadian	Program Director of Global Learning, and faculty member in Business School.	11	Male	Director

** EO: Executive Officer*

Regarding the relationship between the gender and rank of the interviewees and the responses they have given, firstly, in terms of gender, similar to the responses by faculty members, there was not any noticeable influence. I have explained the reasons in *Section ii*, Chapter 5. Administrators (at the Manager and Executive Officer levels) are recruited by a standardized interview and written examination procedure that is designed to offer equal opportunity for all candidates.

From my personal experience, I did not feel that gender had mattered during the selection process when I was applying for my current position at the University.

As to whether the rank of the interviewees mattered regarding the kinds of responses they gave, my observation was that, interviewees at different ranks "saw" different things in the internationalization strategies implementation process. For example, the managers and executive officers gave responses concerning internationalization at the working level, such as intake figures, percentages, student diversity, etc. Those who worked with students in their capacity as full-time administrators involved in exchange program and recruitment of non-local undergraduates (such as *ADMIN090* & *ADMIN140*) also provided their observations on the interactions between local and non-local students.

On the other hand, two administrators (*ADMIN060* & *ADMIN150*) who are concurrently holding faculty positions in the Business School and involved in internationalization initiatives were able to comment more on the teaching and learning aspects of internationalization strategies implementation. Similar to the faculty members' perspective, administrators also had the impression that strategies and decisions were made by a "top down" process. I believe that this mindset has influenced how administrators perceived their role in the internationalization strategies implementation at *KDU*, which is explained in more detail under *Section vii* of this Chapter, as well as the summary and discussion of findings in Chapter 7.

iii. Definition and Level of Internationalization in the University (DSC-1 & 3)

Generally, each of the administrators provided a detailed definition of internationalization of higher education and commented on their perspective of the level of internationalization in the University. Their views were based on more facts and statistics; for example, providing figures and trends to support how they feel about the level of internationalization in the University. The following is a summary of the definition provided by the administrators:

- "I think there are several levels to internationalization. First...to recruit talents from around the world...secondly, to provide opportunities for local students to develop a global mindset, through many ways such as exchange and organizing activities on campus...Thirdly, employers prefer to hire graduates who can accommodate different cultures and social backgrounds; through internationalization, the student body will be more diversified, so that the learning environment will not be so homogenous as well." (*ADMIN060*)

- "The way we teach students should not always follow the local style, but we should also learn from international or regional practices. Moreover, we can invite more researchers from around the world to conduct research at our University." (*ADMIN090*)

- "The environment should be internationalized, such as the origins and nationalities of student and faculty members, and the different cultures they bring about to the campus. Another thing is about our research, what we teach in our courses and how much of the content is connected with what is being taught internationally. Thirdly, the co-curricular activities or extra-curricular activities will reflect the institution's level of internationalization." (*ADMIN130*)

- "Internationalization of higher education is, basically, how students are more volatile, more flexible to go studying abroad. They look for cities and programs that fit them, and they would not mind travelling

across the world to study." (*ADMIN140*)

- "Internationalization is an education, a mindset that we're trying to encourage our students to have, which are open-minded, flexible frames of reference, and understanding of global issues. On the university side, internationalization is often looked at as the number of 'non-local passports' that are in the student body. Another element is the number of exchange students or the number of students studying aboard at our home university or studying outside our university. In total, I think it would be the nature of the students and the nature of the education." (*ADMIN150*)

A common point raised in four responses (by *ADMIN060, ADMIN090, ADMIN130 & ADMIN150*) was about educating students and developing their mindset to be receptive of different cultures and global issues. *ADMIN060* especially mentioned providing "opportunities for local students to develop a global mindset", and creating a not so "homogeneous" learning environment for the students, are in line with the concept of "Internationalization at Home". The recruitment of non-local students was another common point mentioned by several administrators. I consider that it is natural for them to regard this as one of the core aspects of internationalization, as it directly relates to their administrative responsibilities. Student exchange, or student mobility, was also included in three responses (*ADMIN060, ADMIN140 & ADMIN150*), as they expressed that internationalization involved both receiving and sending of students in the exchange program.

It is interesting to note for *ADMIN090*'s response, she mentioned not following the "local style" of teaching and suggested that the University should "learn from international or regional practices". Her views are similar to two of the local student interviewees, who mentioned about "modeling the teaching style after some overseas practices" (*STU100*), and "the teaching content should also cover topics that

are top standard in the world" (*STU110*) in their definition of internationalization of higher education. This similarity in the perspective of internationalization by locals can be explained by K. H. Mok's critical reflections on internationalization in the post-colonial context in Asia. Mok argues that universities in Asia have tried to internationalize by following "Anglo-Saxon models". He hopes that universities will become more aware of the "danger" of new imperialism in education. Living in a postcolonial context, Asian universities should be more critical about what they have learnt from "the West" and be careful not to confuse "globalization" with "Americanization" (2007: 448-449).

Generally speaking, the administrators' definitions placed more emphasis on attracting students, as well as teaching and organizing activities for them. They seemed to have neglected other aspects in Knight & de Wit's definition, about internationalization being a process with different stages, including awareness, commitment, planning, operationalizing, review and reinforcement (1995: 25-28). Most importantly, they did not see themselves as "actors in the play"; for instance, they were aware of the things that can or should be done in order to achieve internationalization, but, they did not see how administrators themselves were part of the internationalized higher education setting, and how their mindset would influence the internationalization process. In fact, administrators are the major driving forces behind the effective implementation of internationalization strategies.

When administrators were asked to evaluate the level of internationalization in the University, they all told a similar story of a rising trend in the number of non-local full-time and exchange-in undergraduates admitted since 2005. *ADMIN140*, who is involved in non-local undergraduate student recruitment,

said back in 2005, there were only 15 full-time international students (not including those from Mainland China), and in 2012, they have received close to 2,000 applications. *ADMIN150* provided more detailed figures, which the University has in total over 700 non-local students registered in full-time program across the three years of study. Among the newly admitted non-local students of the year, there was a 50-50 split of about 150 international students and 150 Mainland Chinese students. *ADMIN060* also mentioned about the growth in exchange program, currently with 35% of undergraduates going out on exchange during the course of their undergraduate studies at *KDU*, and eventually reaching the target of 50% within the next 2 to 3 years. However, he commented that the restriction imposed by the HKSAR Government on the maximum quota of non-local annual undergraduate intake may, in the long run, limit the level of internationalization in higher education institutions in Hong Kong. Currently, the annual quota is 20%, which translates into almost 3,000 non-local undergraduate students to be admitted for all eight UGC-funded higher education institutions in Hong Kong (an explanation of how this figure is determined by the UGC was already provided in *Section iv*, Chapter 2). *ADMIN060* said, "If the Hong Kong Government is serious about recruiting talents, I think the cap should be increased...perhaps this figure (3,000 students) is not sufficient."

Lastly, *ADMIN130* raised the point about the University's "high rankings" in global university rankings in recent years as a good indicator of the level of internationalization in the university, because it is "in line with international standards of assessing good universities." A similar view about university rankings is shared among students and faculty members as well. However, I believe that, as mentioned in the previous chapter about how the change in assessment method for "Global MBA

Rankings" has affected the one local university's MBA program ranking for this year, (Ng 2012: 3), university rankings may not be very reliable indicators of "good practices", as it is subject to adjustments from one year to another.

iv. Reason(s) for Students to Choose KDU and How They Relate with Internationalization (PSC-1 & 3)

Findings from administrators showed that their perspectives on why students choose to study at the University were similar to students and faculty members. Again, Hong Kong being the "gateway to China" was the major reason administrators considered for students to choose to study here. Another common reason was the University's "global ranking"; those who are involved in exchange programs (*ADMIN090* & *ADMIN150*) mentioned that students prefer to go on exchange in institutions that are more "well-known" or "easier to identify as a destination". *ADMIN060* also said that good rankings can help students see the quality of the University's teaching, research, faculty-student ratio, etc.

One point agreed by three administrators (*ADMIN060, ADMIN130* & *ADMIN150*), which was not mentioned by either students or faculty members, was Hong Kong's relatively "low tuition fees" for non-local students as an attraction for students to choose *KDU.* According to *ADMIN150,* the global economic downturn since 2008 resulted in "Hong Kong's tuition being a very good deal for many families"; *ADMIN060* expressed that, for Mainland Chinese parents, sending their children to Hong Kong as compared to other places overseas would save on tuition fees as well as be geographically closer to their children.

As to whether these reasons to study at *KDU* were related to internationalization initiatives, administrators generally felt that it was an indirect relationship, which was based more on "positive word-of-mouth" by their peers who have studied at *KDU.* Non-local students would feel more comfortable studying here as they would have friends, old classmates, or other students who came from the same country to seek advice from or ask questions.

v. Relationship between Administrators, Faculty & Local / Non-Local Students (POC-2-8)

Firstly, as mentioned in the previous chapter, there were only a few interactions between faculty members and administrators on matters related to internationalization. Similarly, from administrators' interviews, only two of them (*ADMIN060* & *ADMIN130*) mentioned how they have worked with faculty members on internationalization initiatives. *ADMIN060* mentioned that when they started recruiting international students in 2006 (as part of the "non-local" student recruitment), there were efforts to convince faculty members "to offer an opportunity for diversity and not just admit Mainland Chinese students." Since then, faculty members have been supportive of the internationalization initiative and believed that this is "good for their department". *ADMIN130*'s interactions with faculty members were with those who have taken up administrative roles being the Deans and Associate Deans of the Schools. From their feedback, it shows that there are some occasions for administrators and faculty members to work together on internationalization initiatives.

As for interactions between administrators and local / non-local students, many of them work with both local and non-local students in their area of work, such

as exchange program, student recruitment and student activities. For the full-time degree-seeking non-local students, most of the students they knew were from Mainland China and other Asian countries, while those who were here on exchange were mostly from European countries or North America. According to *ADMIN060*, he has received concerns expressed by local students on housing and classes which were related to the University's internationalization initiatives. He said "we (administrators) should try and listen more to the students about their opinion and do regular surveys among local and non-local students", and actually local students' concern about on-campus student housing have posed restrictions on achieving the target for internationalization. *ADMIN140*, who works more closely with non-local students from outside Mainland China, said their team was comfortable in distributing the information students needed, such as the university rankings, on-campus facilities and number of students from their home country. Lastly, *ADMIN150* noted that students seemed to be interested in how the university administration's plans would influence their education, classroom learning and campus life. Most importantly, *ADMIN150* commented that the "education of staff" to be more sensitive, compassionate or understanding about non-local student issues is essential, as the staff are the first contact point between students and the University. Unfortunately, according to him, this is something which has not been done.

Several administrators also commented on what they knew about the relationship between faculty members and students. *ADMIN090* said she knew some local students would approach faculty members after class for questions, because they did not feel comfortable to ask questions in English in class. This is similar to the accounts provided by the two local students, *STU100* & *STU110* during their interviews. On the other hand, *ADMIN130* thought that faculty members also put in a

lot of effort in creating exchange opportunities for students and to help them gain a global perspective through learning or other extra-curricular activities. *ADMIN060* raised a similar point, that faculty members were already aware of the fact that the student body is not as "homogenous" as before, and they were more sensitive in terms of preparing for their lectures and teaching materials. More on administrators' observations on teaching and learning strategy of in an international classroom will be discussed in *Section vii* of this chapter.

vi. Administrators' Observations about Student Interactions and What makes Students "Happy" about Life in University? (POC-1 & 9)

Administrators' observations on how local and non-local students interact were quite similar to students' own accounts and faculty members' observations from their interviews. They did observe students forming their own "cultural groups", meaning that students have the tendency to stay among those from the same country or similar cultural background. Both *ADMIN130* and *ADMIN150* said that actually local students enjoy having students from outside Hong Kong to be here, but there has been very little mix between local and non-local students, especially those who came from outside Mainland China. *ADMIN130* explained that the locals did not refuse to integrate with non-locals, but the barrier seemed to be that those educated in conventional schools (local high schools under the traditional system attended by local students) had little experience interacting with non-locals prior to entering university. On the other hand, *ADMIN130* observed that local students who were "internationally educated", such as those who attended local international schools under US or UK curriculum would be more willing to mix with the non-locals. This observation is similar to the experience of *STU080*, who is a local-born Chinese who studied in an international high school in Hong Kong.

On the other hand, *ADMIN090* told an interesting story about an exchange student from Europe, who shared with her that even though he did not understand Cantonese, he still participated in activities organized by student societies on campus. He enjoyed the atmosphere of being with the "locals", although students around him kept speaking in their mother tongue (Cantonese). This story shows that local students seem to be less sensitive towards other cultures when they are among other local peers, and it will take extra efforts by non-local students to try and "blend" into the local majority if they wish to interact with local students.

Lastly, for comments on whether administrators thought students were "happy" about their campus life, all of their responses were positive. Two of them (*ADMIN060* & *ADMIN150*) used an example of feedback from a student satisfaction survey, with over 70% students answering "satisfied" or "very satisfied" about their undergraduate experience upon graduation. Others stressed the importance of extra-curricular activities, such as student societies, study tours, exchange programs, social services, etc, and how students could learn to become an all-round person. The stress from heavy study work load was also acknowledged by *ADMIN060*, and he hoped that with the newly implemented four-year curriculum, students would feel less pressure from fulfilling academic requirements with one additional year of study.

vii. Strategy of Internationalization – Administrators' Perspective (STC-1-7)

Among the three groups of stakeholders (students, faculty members and administrators), it is likely that the administrators are most knowledgeable about aspects related to the university's internationalization strategies. The following are the responses from administrators related to strategies and their evaluation on the

effectiveness of implementation. Analysis of their responses shows that the above assumption is true to some extent, but administrators seem to be more concerned with figures and statistics. Also, those who have concurrent roles in teaching and administration are more knowledgeable about the implications of internationalization strategies in learning and teaching.

Firstly, regarding the decision makers of the internationalization strategy, administrators were able to name a number of senior governing bodies, including the Court (which has a consultative role), the Council (which has an overall decision-making role) and the Senate (which has an academic decision-making role). The President, the Provost and the Vice-Presidents were considered senior administrators who also take part in high-level decision-making processes. Each of the Schools was headed by a Dean and several Associate Deans, who worked with the Undergraduate Recruitment and Admissions Office as well as the Global Student Office on matters related to non-local undergraduate full-time and exchange student recruitment. Recently, a newly created position of Vice-President for Institutional Advancement was responsible for initiating new exchange partnerships, and cooperation for degree programs or joint degree programs. According to the administrators, this is a top-down structure, where decisions were made at the "top" and executed by administrative offices "below".

As to how much the administrators knew about the internationalization strategies, three of them (*ADMIN060, ADMIN130 & ADMIN140*) mentioned about a "Five-Year Strategic Plan" published by the University in 2011, with clear targets on many aspects of internationalization, such as facilitating exchange among other world-leading institutions, recruiting additional faculty members from around the

world (to cope with the four-year undergraduate curriculum), reaching the target of 20% annual intake of non-local undergraduates, of which no more than 50% will come from Mainland China, and reaching the target of 50% undergraduates participating in exchange programs annually. *ADMIN140* also mentioned about "Hong Kong's target in becoming an 'education hub' to attract talented students from around the world", which was a target set in the Hong Kong SAR Government's Chief Executive Policy Address in 2007. *ADMIN090 & ADMIN150* said they have read the related strategic documents but did not comment on the content. From their responses, it is apparent that administrators have quite comprehensive knowledge of the internationalization strategies for the University as well as Hong Kong in general.

The administrators were asked whether they considered it an issue that students have not read any of the strategy documents or publications and are not sure where to locate them. None of them considered this an issue, with reasons such as: Students are focused in their studies and therefore would not have time to read these documents; students will experience first-hand the internationalized campus environment when they begin their studies here; students were not targeted as the main readers for these documents; and they can easily search for information about *KDU* on the University's website.

Statistically speaking, administrators agreed that the strategies have been implemented effectively towards reaching the various targets. They have also shared what they felt as areas for improvement in terms of the quality and quantity of student integration. For example, *ADMIN150* said in order for internationalization to be successful on campus, both "outward and inward" perspectives would be needed. The "outward" perspective referred to "getting as many international students as possible";

the "inward" perspective meant "maximizing the benefits of having international students on campus". This is similar to the concept of "Internationalization at Home", and a similar view was shared by *ADMIN060*, who said "those who stay in Hong Kong can also meet with many exchange-in students, attend classes and do projects with them". On the other hand, *ADMIN140* suggested the student intake should be further diversified, and the University should explore "new markets" for recruiting full-time non-local undergraduates, such as North America, South America or Europe, which have "more growth to be had." *ADMIN150* commented on the "quota restriction" of 20% annual non-local student intake imposed by the Hong Kong SAR Government, which limited further advancement towards internationalization, as 20% was still a minority in terms presence on campus. Also in terms of government policy, *ADMIN060* commented that there should be a "cross-bureau policy" in place for better coordination among government departments, such as immigration, manpower, industrial and education, as the current policies seem fragmented with each bureau doing their own work.

Lastly, for the teaching and learning strategies in an international classroom, the two administrators (*ADMIN060 & ADMIN150*) who are also faculty members in the Business School shared more about their views on teaching students from different backgrounds. For *ADMIN060*, he mentioned group work, and how faculty members tried to include diversity by having some local and non-local students mix in a group, which was similar to what *FAC050* (also a faculty member from Business) has shared about her teaching experience in the interview. According to *ADMIN150*, he used examples from around the world to illustrate ideas in class, and he knew many other faculty members did the same, which reflects the similar stories shared by students about what they learnt in class. He also suggested there

should be a balance between materials relevant to the context and examples of different perspectives from elsewhere, as local students often struggle to understand the cultures or perspectives of case studies from overseas. Very often, *ADMIN150* noted, that teachers should play a part in "extracting the benefits of international students in their classroom", as "the presence of international students in class does not automatically lead to understanding of multiple perspectives." *FAC020* also shared similar concerns on whether the benefits from internationalized learning experience have been maximized, and whether local students were fully aware and convinced of those benefits.

Besides teaching, *ADMIN150* gave his observations on the learning attitudes of students from different backgrounds. For the exchange students, although they were vocal in class, this was not always appreciated by the local students. This view is similar to *FAC040*'s comment that sometimes these students spoke up "just to hear their own voice." Moreover, *ADMIN150* observed that "for the full-time, degree-seeking, non-local international students, they can struggle with the teaching style in class. So, their CGA's (grade point average) can suffer at first while they are here...settling in takes some time and understanding on their part." Similarly, the Korean student, *STU120*, shared how she struggled at first with Chemistry and Physics and spent the first holiday to catch up on the subjects, and shared a similar story of a friend studying Mathematics as well. These observations show that administrators with teaching experience were more in tune with the issues and struggles for both students and faculty members in the international classroom.

On the other hand, the three other administrators without concurrent teaching duties (*ADMIN090*, *ADMIN130* & *ADMIN140*) did not provide much input

on internationalization strategy on teaching and learning. Two of them, *ADMIN090* and *ADMIN130* commented on the relationship between the nature of the discipline and the level of internationalization in teaching content. Similar to the perspectives of students and faculty members who were interviewed, they felt that science and engineering disciplines have little room for internationalization, as those courses involve mostly quantitative and factual materials. However, according to Crowther et al., regardless of whether the subject is a "universal" scientific phenomenon, such as physics or mathematics, sensitivity to different cultural styles of learning is still an essential component in an intercultural environment (2000:18). Otherwise, stories of how non-local students struggle to adjust to the learning environment may keep recurring with the new intake of students year after year.

viii. Chapter Summary

This chapter discussed the findings from analysis on data collected from the last group of stakeholders, the administrators. Their perspectives on internationalization of higher education were quite different from students and faculty members, with heavy emphasis placed on figures, statistics and facts. They made observations on issues of student integration, and non-local students' struggles in adapting to the "local" curriculum or teaching styles. Interestingly, administrators with previous teaching experience or concurrently holding a teaching position at the University were more knowledgeable about teaching strategies in an international classroom.

It was also observed that, the administrators were not fully aware, by working towards internationalization and the effectiveness of strategies

implementation, they were part of the internationalized higher education environment as well. In other words, they have yet realized the importance of being a "reflexive practitioner", and how their lives may have been changed (at the same time as students and faculty members) by the internationalization of their institution. Lastly, one administrator, *ADMIN150*, raised the issue that the "education of staff" is essential for them to have a better understanding of non-local students, which I very much agreed. I hope more administrators would begin to realize this as a way to better assist non-local students with adjustment difficulties, as well as further integrate local students with the non-locals.

Chapter 7 – Summary and Discussion of Findings and Conclusion

i. Introduction

In the final Chapter of the dissertation, firstly I give an overall review of the study, the strengths and limitations of the methodological approach, and the data collection process. Then, I discuss several major themes that emerged from the main findings. Lastly, I conclude the dissertation by giving some suggestions on future research and a personal reflection on what I have learnt as a researcher.

ii. Review of the Study

The HKSAR Government, started exploring, in 2007, the possibility of transforming Hong Kong into a "regional education hub" (HKSAR 2007:1), with policies to attract quality non-local students to study in Hong Kong and to further internationalize the higher education sector and increase the exposure of local students, as well as to attract and retain non-local talents in Hong Kong and to enhance the overall competitiveness of Hong Kong in the long run. For the first two aims, the HKSAR Government has approved the increase in the non-local annual undergraduate intake to a maximum of 20% (UGC 2010: 53-54).

In response to the Government's new initiatives, universities in Hong Kong came up with new strategies for internationalization, especially in the area of recruiting talents from both Mainland China and around the world for their undergraduate degree programs. The aim of this qualitative study was to investigate the effectiveness of the implementation of internationalization strategies in higher education institutions in Hong Kong, with *KDU* (a pseudonym I used to disguise the

identity of the University where I am currently employed as an administrator) as the focus of the study. The effectiveness of strategies implementation is studied and compared in two worlds – the "ideal" world, based on strategy documents, publications, and reports, as well as perspectives collected from interviews with administrators of internationalization strategies; and the "reality" faced by students and faculty members, with their first-hand experience in learning and teaching in an "internationalized" university environment collected from interviews.

To carry out the study, first, a set of research questions to be addressed by the study was formulated (please refer to *Section iii*, Chapter 1, for the list of research questions), followed by a review of literature related to internationalization in both local and international contexts, as well as specific case studies from Hong Kong, U.K., U.S. and Australia. The literature review helped me identify the differences between the local and international definitions of internationalization of higher education. Research shows that the lack of linkages between Chinese and Western education heritages have resulted in the "Western borrowings" found in the local definition, such as policies related to "regional education hubs" and direct copying of "Anglo-Saxon models" in many Asian universities. Major critiques on internationalization of higher education were also reviewed, including its interchangeable use with "globalization", implication of the commodification of higher education, concerns of how the notion of "entrepreneurial internationalization" has affected teaching and service quality, and the predominately "Western" models of the internationalization processes.

Literature on another important concept related to internationalization of higher education, "Internationalization at Home", was also reviewed. This concept is

important for understanding the local students' perspectives on internationalization of higher education, as a review of various studies conducted in different places found a commonality that very often, students (both local and international) do not always appreciate the benefits of internationalization on campus or in the curriculum. In order to find out the "reality" at *KDU*, the next step was to identify a research methodology and to design an approach to collect and analyze data collected from key stakeholders (students, faculty members and administrators).

iii. Strengths and Limitations of the Methodological Approach of the Study

In order to select the most suitable research methodology for this study, several major paradigms were reviewed, including the positivist that draws on quantitative techniques to discover a "universal truth" without inferences by the researcher's concerns and values (Usher 1996: 11-12), and the interpretivist that utilizes qualitative techniques and is "value-laden" (Carr: 1995: 98). Based on the above classifications and my values and beliefs, this study was located within the *interpretivist paradigm*, using a qualitative method of collecting data through interviews. The objective of a qualitative study is to interpret the phenomena of the world based on observations gathered from stakeholders' accounts. In this study, the research was mainly based on one institution, *KDU*. Data collected are stakeholders' personal experiences and observations on the University's internationalization and effectiveness of strategy implementation, as well as a reflection of my own experiences in the local higher education sector.

The strengths of this methodological approach are that, compared to the traditional large-scale questionnaires with a quantitative focus on students'

satisfaction and feedback about their learning experience, it allowed me to learn more about the interviewees' "world views", their work/study and first-hand experience in the field of internationalization of higher education. Through talking with the interviewees, I heard stories about the same issue that were told through different "cultural lenses". According to Schutz, "cultural lenses" are often invisible, as people take them for granted in interpreting situations (Rubin & Rubin 2012: 20). By paying attention to the ways words were used and stories were told, a researcher is able to find out the cultural assumptions or underlying "rules and definitions" about her/his interviewees (Ibid).

More importantly, this study has contributed a new perspective on the field of internationalization of higher education, at least in Hong Kong and *KDU*, that is faculty members' attitude and feelings towards strategies' implementation. As mentioned in the introduction, I found that the University has not surveyed the perspectives of faculty members (and administrators) towards the learning attitudes of students from different backgrounds in their classes. This study has "triangulated" the views from three major stakeholder groups involved in the day-to-day campus life, who were directly influenced by how the internationalization strategies were being implemented. Therefore, I believe that the findings in this study have contributed valuable reflections on the "realities" in the field, as compared to "ideals" formulated in strategy documents and publications.

I have also acknowledged in the methodology chapter (*Section ii*, Chapter 3) the limitations of the methodology, such as errors that may be caused by human judgment in qualitative methods, misunderstandings, misinterpretations, and the possible biased "horizon" of the researcher. Another weakness of the interpretivist

paradigm, compared to the positivist, is that the uniqueness of the context and the researcher's perspective makes it impossible for the research to be repeated by another researcher and to yield the same result, known as the research reliability (Silverman 2005). However, qualitative researchers recognize that their studies cannot be replicated and do not set out with that intention. Another limitation was the large amount of time needed to transcribe the interviews (as well as translate the interviews conducted in Cantonese or Putonghua into English) and to analyze the data collected from the interviews. During the data collection and analysis process, I was overwhelmed with the context-rich data, and I had to spend more time and effort than previously anticipated.

Apart from the logistics of transcription, there are other weaknesses associated with the research method, which may have influenced the validity of the study. For example, the coding of interview transcripts, according to Silverman (2005: 182), has an underlying issue of "every way of seeing is also a way of not seeing". This meant that the "categorization" may deflect attention away from "uncategorized" activities. In other relatively large-scale qualitative studies, the coding is usually done by a team of researchers, with the coding results compared to improve the accuracy of the analysis. However, in this study, I have conducted the interviews, done the transcriptions and the coding all by myself, so the credibility of the research relies on me being transparent about the process, my views, values, and how I have reported my findings in the dissertation – and I have striven to do this throughout.

Moreover, I have chosen semi-structured interviews as a method of gathering data for this study, with the advantages already explained in *Section iv* of the methodology chapter (Chapter 3). As Kvale points out (1996: 13), there is no

"common procedure" for interview research, and the forms of interview analysis can differ as widely as ways of reading a text. The researcher, as a person, has "magnified" his/her importance in the research process, as he/she is the main instrument for obtaining "knowledge" in the study (Ibid: 117). Kvale further suggests that, the quality of the researcher is an important aspect for other researchers to "ascribe validity to the findings reported" (Ibid: 241) and to determine the level of credibility of that particular research study. By working towards having this dissertation (or related articles) published, and continuing to contribute new findings, I will add to my credibility as a researcher in the field.

iv. Data Collection Process

In order to ensure the smooth running of the actual interviews, a pilot study was conducted between July and August 2011, with findings from the pilot study submitted as one of the assignments for a taught module in October 2011. The actual interviews were conducted from December 2011 to June 2012, and in total, 15 interviews were completed with five from each group of stakeholders. The interviews were semi-structured, with questions in four major areas 1. Background information of the interviewee; 2. Perspectives on internationalization and related strategies and implementation; 3. Interviewees' personal experience – as a learner, as a teacher or as an administrator; and 4. Anything else the interviewees would like to share about internationalization at *KDU*. Interviewees were also asked to sign a Consent Form at the start of the interview. A transcript (in English, with interviews conducted in Cantonese or Putonghua translated by myself) was sent to them for verification and comments afterwards, and a fixed period of time (two weeks) was given to provide feedback. The interviewees have remained anonymous and are referred to by a code

assigned to each of them.

A coding system was developed for organizing and sorting the data. The entire set contained 39 codes, grouped under five major categories: 1. "setting / context codes"; 2. "definition of situation codes"; 3. "perspectives held by subjects codes"; 4. "subjects' ways of thinking about people and objects codes"; and 5. "strategy codes". Interview transcripts were coded under this system and a summary of findings from each group of stakeholder were outlined in detail in Chapter 4 to 6.

v. *Discussion of Major Findings of the Study – Definition of Internationalization of Higher Education in the Local Context*

In the "global" context, internationalization of higher education has been influenced mostly by events that have occurred in the course of "Western" history, such as the life of Erasmus, the wandering scholar in the Middle Ages; the "colonization" of education systems in the 18th century by colonial powers from U.K. and Europe; and the "Cold War" between the U.S. and Soviet Union, which caused a power shift towards new emerging powers in Asia in the early 1990s. The "textbook definition" of internationalization of higher education is mostly concerned with the process of integrating an international perspective into various aspects in higher education, such as teaching, learning, research and student services. Recent research has also emphasized the development of intercultural competencies among academics, administrators and policy makers, as well as the "reciprocal" nature of internationalization suggested by Turner & Robson (2008: 20).

On the other hand, the definition of internationalization of higher education in the "local" context differs mainly in how it is considered as a "means" to achieve a wider goal. For example, bringing quality academic work and researchers to Mainland China from abroad; "connecting" China to the world; improving quality in the education system and infrastructures with additional income generated from international students; and being "entrepreneurial" in terms of generating revenue and emphasizing "salesmanship (sic)" when offering programs and education for international students (Welch 2012: 300). Asian scholars such as Rui Yang or K.H. Mok have also pointed out that education traditions in this part of the world have never been regarded equally with Western educational heritages, and "direct borrowing" of Western policies and practices are common in the postcolonial context of Hong Kong.

In terms of how stakeholders within *KDU* define internationalization of higher education, it varies from one group to another. Firstly, some students are informed by their personal experience of living or studying abroad prior to entering *KDU*, while others learn about internationalization from the media. For the two students, *STU080* who were educated in a local international school, and *STU120* who was born in Korea and educated in Guangzhou, they emphasize the diversity and understanding of cultures in their definition. *STU080* especially mentions "internationalization should not always focus on Western beliefs", which is a perspective that I did not expect to hear from an undergraduate. On the other hand, *STU100* and *STU110* who were born in Hong Kong and studied in traditional secondary schools, and *STU070* who came from Mainland China, focus more on learning and knowing about "the rest of the world" in their definition, such as "learning from faculty members from around the world" (*STU070*); "modeling the

teaching style after some overseas practices" (*STU100*); and "the teaching content should cover topics that are top standard in the world" (*STU110*). So, it seems that, the "context" of where a student lived and studied, and the level of international exposure prior to entering the University have shaped their views on internationalization of higher education.

As to how faculty members define internationalization of higher education, firstly, three out of five faculty members (*FAC010*, *FAC020* and *FAC040*) question the policy about including Mainland Chinese students in the calculation of "non-local" student figures. Other faculty members (*FAC030* and *FAC050*) mention about educating students to think globally and internationalizing the teaching faculty, but none of the responses mention explicitly abut internationalizing the curriculum *FAC040* also gives a "warning" that "one should be careful not to confuse 'internationalization' with 'Westernization'". Therefore, compared with students, faculty members seem to be more knowledgeable about both the context and challenges of internationalization of higher education in Hong Kong.

The local definition, especially that provided by administrators, had the most influence on the formulation and implementation of internationalization strategies in *KDU*. It seems that "increasing the number of non-local undergraduates" is the most important aspect of the strategies, according to both the documents reviewed, as well as the administrators interviewed, and they all told a similar story of an upward trend in the number of non-local full time and exchange-in undergraduates from 2005 to the present. Interestingly, several administrators commented on the "low tuition fee" paid by non-local students as one of the attractions for them to study in Hong Kong, but in fact, this "low tuition fee" is already substantially higher than the

"local tuition fee" (HK$100,000 versus HK$42,100 per year). Therefore, it is clear that admitting non-local students generates a considerable amount of income for local institutions.

Another major attraction to international students, according to students, faculty members and administrators alike, is Hong Kong's position of being "a gateway to China". This is also unique to Hong Kong, in that the internationalization strategies serve another purpose of bringing in students from overseas into China. However, given the relatively low percentage of non-local students currently coming from outside Hong Kong *and* China, one may question whether international students already consider Hong Kong being *part of* China after 1997, and whether a re-thinking of the strategies is needed in the postcolonial context.

vi. Discussion of Major Findings of the Study – Stakeholders' Evaluation of Effectiveness of Internationalization Strategies Implementation

From the sharing of personal experience during interviews with the first group of stakeholders, students, I see how they position themselves and deal with their struggles in the University's development towards an internationalized environment. For the locals who are educated in "conventional secondary schools", it seems they are being "thrown into" an English-speaking, multicultural environment after spending years in a rather homogenous learning environment. They do realize this is a valuable opportunity for international exposure, but sometimes they lack the skills or language abilities to make the best use of this opportunity. For instance, *STU110* says there is always "work" involved (school work, student ambassador's duties, etc.) when interacting with non-local students. He envies the social interactions among non-local students themselves, but finds himself unable to establish the same

rapport for some unknown reasons/barriers. *STU100* enjoyed her study abroad experience in Switzerland, but she does not have many friends who are non-local students at her home institution (*KDU*).

In contrast, *STU080* and *STU120* are more used to making friends with students from different backgrounds; for example, *STU080* mentioned that she met students from 85 countries in her high school. Therefore, they consider the internationalized university environment as a continuation of their high school experience, rather than something totally new to them. However, non-local students such as *STU120* feel there is a "bubble" between locals and non-locals, such as the separate orientation activities for locals and non-locals, and she described her initial struggles with science subjects because her background knowledge is not compatible with that from the Hong Kong's secondary school system.

For faculty members, they are aware of the different backgrounds of students in class and adjust their teaching styles, such as avoid using Cantonese in class, provide bilingual or translated materials, and include examples or case studies from Hong Kong/Asia as well as America/Europe. Some (such as *FAC020* & *FAC050*) also encouraged group work among students from different backgrounds, but with varying results. However, the most important issue, as observed by several faculty members, is the local students' English language ability, and how that has affected their in-class participation. For example, the local faculty members often see local students approaching them to ask questions in Cantonese or Putonghua after class, or choosing local group members so that they can speak in their mother tongue during group discussion in class. Non-local faculty members have experience with local students not being able to understand the lecture in English, and even describe local

students' situation as being "stranded", according to *FAC040*. That is also the reason for *FAC040* to use bilingual (English and Chinese) powerpoint slides in class. Perhaps due to this reason, faculty members notice separation among different student groups on campus, such as "hanging around in their own groups" in cafeterias. Besides, there is some "tension" and "conflict of interest" observed by faculty members; for instance, the Science faculty (*FAC010*) hearing local students complain that "good grades were always taken by Mainland students", or another faculty member (*FAC020*) hearing how local students question the internationalization policy and how they have yet to be convinced of the benefits.

According to the administrators' accounts, the various targets in internationalization strategies have been reached, as published in official university documents and statistics. Internally, *KDU* has also set a target of allocating no more than 50% of the non-local student quota to those from Mainland China, and this target has been reached in the current academic year. Realistically, administrators agree that there are still areas for improvement, in terms of "maximizing the benefits of having international students on campus", "exploring new markets", and "expanding the quota restriction on non-local student intake".

As to stakeholders' "feelings" about the effectiveness of the implementation of the strategies, there are mixed feelings and responses, depending on their backgrounds and disciplines. Students in Science and Engineering do not feel the presence of internationalization in their "home" discipline, but rather they enjoy a more internationalized curriculum and learning environment in humanities and social science electives. Being in a restrictive curriculum designed for "Year 0" students, *STU070* especially feels that what she has been learning, at least during the first

semester here, is not yet internationalized, except for the use of English in class. On the other hand, the Business student (*STU080*) is highly appreciative of the interactive and intercultural learning she has experienced in her discipline, through case studies, class discussion and group work, although she also remains skeptical as to whether the "local" students from Hong Kong can see the benefits of internationalized teaching strategies, when there are assessment involved (such as "participation points").

vii. Discussion of Major Findings of the Study – "Missing Links" between "Ideals" and "Realities" of Internationalization Strategies Implementation

In the "ideal" world, 20% of the undergraduate students come from outside Hong Kong, with an additional 50% of undergraduates participating in exchange at least once during the course of the undergraduate studies at *KDU*. Various programs and enrichment activities, as well as the new four-year undergraduate curriculum (starting from 2012/13 academic year) provide ample opportunities for cross-cultural understanding and interaction among students, staff and the university community. English is used as the medium of instruction in courses, and students also have many opportunities outside classroom for social interactions, such as being an "exchange buddy" or a "student ambassador". Students, local and non-local alike, will experience personal growth and gain international exposure through the University's internationalization strategies and initiatives.

In "reality" however, at least half of the 20% non-local student quota at *KDU* is filled by those from Mainland China, which, according to OECD's statistics, also constitute the largest group of students studying abroad (19% of all international

students studying abroad in OECD countries) (OECD 2012: 369). In fact, in the previous academic year (2011/12), according to the UGC survey of first year student intake, only 15% of the entire non-local student intake in Hong Kong came from *outside* Mainland China *(figures obtained from University Grants Committee's survey; see link on P.130)*, while UGC's statistics on non-local student enrolment across the three years' of study has a slightly higher percentage of 23% non-local students from *outside* Mainland China *(figures obtained from University Grants Committee's online statistics database; see link on P.130)*. Exchange students, on the other hand, indeed came from more diversified countries in Southeast Asia, Europe and North America (evident from the list of exchange partners available on *KDU*'s Global Student Office website), but not all faculty members (for example, *FAC030* and *FAC040*) and administrators (for example, *ADMIN150*) are satisfied with their learning attitude, and not all students, especially "locals" such as *STU100* and *STU110* engage in social interactions with this group of exchange-in students.

As stated at the beginning of the study, "non-local" students, by definition in the Hong Kong context, are "persons entering Hong Kong for the purpose of education, with a student visa or entry permit issued by the Immigration Department of the HKSAR Government" (http://www.immd.gov.hk/ehtml/hkvisas_1.htm#intro). Therefore, regardless of the origin being Mainland China or other countries/regions, students entering Hong Kong with a visa are considered "non-local". However, as Mainland China continues to be a major market in the recruitment of non-local students, with quality applicants flooding in year after year (statistics show that there was a growth of over 50% in applications received from Mainland China in the past year, and more than three times the total received from the rest of the world), it is inevitable that Mainland Chinese students will remain dominant in the population of

"non-local" students in Hong Kong. Even though in *KDU*, the strategy is to have a 50-50 split between students from Mainland China and the rest of the world for the 20% non-local admission quota, 50% of the so-called "non-local" annual undergraduate intake will remain relatively "homogenous", thus creating an impression of "Mainlandization", similar to what *FAC020* believes as the reason for many local students to question the purpose of internationalization in higher education.

Administrators such as *ADMIN060* and *ADMIN130* point out that the quota restriction of 20% annual undergraduate intake for non-local students is not sufficient to create a significant presence of international students on campus, and the cap should be increased, if the HKSAR Government is "serious about recruiting talents". However, I believe that the ***first*** "missing link" lies in the definition of "non-local" students in the Hong Kong context of internationalization. Institutions, together with the HKSAR Government, should reflect on ways to gradually achieve a more balanced student intake and reduce the dominance of a single place of origin in the entire "non-local" student population.

On the "local" students' side, in the book by Trahar on *Developing Cultural Capability in International Higher Education*, she uses examples of "local" students in the U.K. to show that local students' perspectives on developing cultural capability is important to the success of "Internationalization at Home" strategies (2011: 80). Other case studies in Hong Kong, U.K., U.S. and Australia as discussed in the literature review also point to common dissatisfaction among international students in different countries on the lack of social interaction with local students, the indifferent attitude of local students towards those who speak another language, or

"privileged knowledge" that has not been shared with international students. Somewhat differently, the local students I have interviewed (*STU100* & *STU110*), show great interest in learning about other cultures, but they do lack the skills or motivation to establish social rapport with non-local students, other than working together for school work/group projects, or task-orientated activities officially organized by the University. As Turner and Robson argue that internationalization should be "reciprocal" in nature (2008: 20), while universities think of ways to integrate "non-local" and "local" students, I suggest that the ***second*** "missing link" lies in the lack of "orientation" given to local students about an internationalized learning environment, prior to the start of their university studies. After all, experiences with intercultural learning are rare among Hong Kong students educated in "conventional secondary schools", as compared to those few students like *STU080*, who received her secondary education in an international school. Many of them are born and raised among a rather "homogenous" cohort of classmates, and some of them were not even learning in English in every subject at school. Therefore, it is rather impractical, and perhaps a bit unfair, to "throw" this group of students directly into an internationalized learning environment, thinking that they will automatically become "good hosts" to non-local students in the next three to four years of undergraduate study.

Further to the internationalized learning environment, the strategy of using English in class also functions like a "double-edged sword"; on the one hand, facilitating communication between students from different countries; on the other hand, creating hindrances for local students to express their ideas, ask questions or participate in discussions, and in some extreme cases, leaving them "stranded" (according to *FAC040*) in the course. Programs and initiatives designed to provide

opportunities for cross-cultural understanding and interaction do have their merits; for instance, the "student ambassadors" program participated by *STU100*, which offered him a chance to work with non-local students in outreaching to the university community. However, observations and personal experiences of students, faculty members and administrators attest to the "reality" of separated social groups, so the "real" effects of establishing social rapport through organized activities remain uncertain.

The ***third***, and the last "missing link", which I am suggesting based on the main research findings, is the "individual-institutional partnership" between decision makers, administrators and faculty members. At the beginning of Chapters 5 & 6, I have discussed how faculty members and administrators generally do not consider themselves as being decision makers in the internationalization strategies formulation process. I have heard faculty members share that decisions are often received "from the sixth floor" (location of the senior administrators' offices), and administrators mentioned that the implementation of strategies is based on a "top-down" structure, where decisions are made at the "top" and executed by administrative offices "below".

Moreover, it is noted, from responses by a number of Science and Engineering faculty members (*FAC010* and *FAC030*), students (*STU070*, *STU100* and *STU110*), as well as administrators (*ADMIN090* and *ADMIN130*), that some disciplines are "factual", "universal", and "taught the same way in many countries in the world". They seem to have rejected the notion that their discipline can be "internationalized", and therefore are on Level 2 (left side) of the "spectrum of acceptance" on internationalization of the curriculum – "Internationalization is

inappropriate" (Bell 2004: 54). On the other hand, the Business faculty member (*FAC050*), student (*STU080*), as well as administrators currently holding faculty positions in Business (*ADMIN060* and *ADMIN150*) consider internationalization as an integral part of the curriculum in their discipline, which is on Level 4 (right side) of the spectrum (Ibid). As for faculty members in Social Science (*FAC020* and *FAC040*), they are closer to Level 3 of the spectrum – "Internationalization of content is possible".

In the above instances, an "individual-institutional partnership", proposed by Dewey & Duff (2009: 503), may be useful for decision makers to proactively communicate with faculty members about internationalization strategies, so that a comprehensive internationalization process may be achieved. Challenges and restrictions faced by individual program curricula, such as accreditation requirements by professional organizations that are common in the Engineering curriculum (Hyland et al. 2008: 15) will also need to be communicated thoroughly between faculty members and administrators in order to come up with appropriate strategies in internationalizing curriculum with accreditation constraints.

viii. Suggestions for Future Research in the Internationalization of Higher Education in Hong Kong

In conclusion, this study has answered the research questions related to how internationalization is defined internationally and locally, the strategies of internationalization employed at *KDU* in response to HKSAR Government's policy of building a "regional education hub", and the "missing link" in strategies implementation, between the "ideals" presented in documents and statistics, and the "realities" based on perspectives and evaluations by key stakeholders. For future

research, I will explore the possibility of working with colleagues in other local higher education institutions to interview their students, faculty members and stakeholders to find out their evaluation of internationalization strategies in the context of their own institution. It will be interesting to compare responses across institutions to find out how stakeholders perceive internationalization strategies' implementation in different university settings. In terms of research within *KDU*, I hope to continue collecting data from students admitted in the 2012/13 academic year and onwards, as they will be entering the new four-year undergraduate curriculum. I will find out if their experiences and observations are different from those interviewed in this study, under the "old" curriculum.

As mentioned by the faculty interviewee in Social Science (*FAC020*), their School has established a new undergraduate degree program in Global China Studies. Since I have not interviewed students admitted into this new program, this is an area worth further exploring. Clearly, from the name of this program, one assumes that students will be experiencing an internationalized curriculum and learning in an international classroom. I can anticipate their views on internationalization at *KDU* will be quite different from students in Science, Engineering and Business.

Lastly, evaluation of local students' English language abilities is not covered in the scope of the study, but it was apparent from faculty and student observations that this has caused issues with local students' motivation and capability towards interacting with international students and actively participating in an international classroom. In fact, I was surprised to hear from faculty members during the interviews about the rather negative impressions of local students' English proficiency, as compared to the positive comments on Mainland students' ability to

understand English. This is another area of future research that I am interested in, and this may provide additional data and new perspectives on local students' position and struggles within the context of internationalization of higher education in Hong Kong.

ix. Personal Reflections – What Have I Learned as a Researcher?

I would like to end this dissertation by sharing my personal reflections on internationalization of higher education in Hong Kong, both as a member of staff working at *KDU* and an EdD student enrolled in an overseas program offered in Hong Kong. I have been working at *KDU* for over seven years now; I have also observed similar rising trends as other administrators in terms of non-local undergraduates and exchange-in students. In elevators, cafeterias, hallways, I often hear groups of students speaking in their mother tongue. On the other hand, banners and flyers used in promotional activities by student societies and interest groups are primarily written in Chinese, and entries on the University's "Big Character Poster Wall" (which functions like a "democratic wall" for students to express their opinion about university policies and Hong Kong/China/International current events and politics) are mostly written in Chinese and seldom translated into English, except for official university announcements. On Friday evenings, it is common to see groups of foreign students (probably the exchange-in's) dressed up and waiting for public transportation to the nearest MTR station, probably heading to restaurants and pubs in the famous Central district known as "Lan Kwai Fong", while many are still working in the library and computer labs. It seems to me, that we have a vibrant campus, with youngsters coming from many different places, pursing their studies and their dreams. But, while pursing their aspirations, their paths seldom cross with those from different backgrounds, except when they have to work together for specific

assignments/projects/tasks (similar to what *STU110* shared in his experience). Moreover, for Science or Engineering classes without any group work or discussion activities, their paths would still rarely cross after spending one semester together, as observed by *FAC020*.

The situation is different when comparing this to my own EdD experience of attending taught modules. Usually, the class size is small (around 20 classmates), and besides classmates from Hong Kong, I also met those from Mainland China, Japan, the Philippines, Africa, and the United States. Although each module lasts just over a weekend, there are plenty of opportunities to interact with classmates for discussion and exchange of ideas and experience. Sometimes, when choosing our own group mates, inevitably, Hong Kong students prefer to work with fellow Hong Kongers, as we only have one day to work on a group presentation, so students tend to work with co-nationals when under a tight schedule (Ippolito 2007: 757). However, I appreciate the effort by module tutors in designing various group activities involving randomly assigned or purposefully assigned group mates, so that I am not just working with fellow Hong Kongers all the time. The modules are highly interactive, and I recall once or twice that our classmates enjoyed the time together so much, that we voluntarily set up a list of email/Facebook contacts for keeping in touch with each other's progress in the EdD.

The above reflections show that, in order for internationalization strategies to be effective, much effort needs to be put into designing and executing an internationalized curriculum by faculty members as well as decision makers and administrators. Students also need to actively participate in the exchange of ideas, in order to facilitate better understanding of different cultural perspectives on a particular

discussion topic or on the overall course content. However, students must be well aware of the context of the international classroom they are in, so that they know the value of maximizing the benefits of the learning environment. While EdD students are engaged in educational research and are knowledgeable in how "context matters", most undergraduates, especially locals in *KDU*, may need further "orientation" or "training" to be acclimatized with internationalization before they can truly appreciate intercultural learning opportunities in class, as well as become more sensitive to others who speak a different language on campus.

In summary, my view is, being "reflexive" and understanding how "context matters", are not only important in my research study, but they are also ways of thinking about yourself and others, that we should try to instill our students, and encourage our faculty members and administrators to develop. By doing so, we may work towards the understanding of "horizons" (or "realities") of others from different backgrounds, which may, in turn, positively influence the effectiveness of the internationalization strategies implementation in the future.

After working in the field of higher education in Hong Kong as an administrator since 2001, in 2007, I decided to pursue an EdD degree, with an aim to learn more about the field of education. It was really interesting (as well as confusing) at first to learn about the various paradigms and methodologies in educational research. But I still remember today from the first module on Understanding Educational Research, our module tutor said, "Context matters, more than you think it does." As I attended other modules and worked on different assignments, it became more apparent that my values and experiences would always be a part (if not a vital part) of the research I was doing. Moreover, I was not just participating in the course

as a "learner", but also as a "contributor", through class discussions and presentations, I shared with my classmates my experiences, difficulties and views as a practitioner in the field and learned from other classmates at the same time. I enjoyed the learning experience in various modules, especially as I was among classmates who were in a similar "context" as myself, being practitioners in higher education institutions from both Hong Kong and abroad.

Working on the dissertation has been a challenging experience for me. From my bachelor's and master's studies, my approach to essay or report writing usually involved reviewing literature and studies by other researchers in the field in order to formulate some sort of "theory" for my essay/report, and then using more literature to "support" this "theory". Therefore, it was a new experience for me to design this research study "from scratch", first setting the background, research questions, writing a literature review, deciding on the methodological approach, collecting/analyzing data, and finally, reporting the findings and writing up the entire dissertation. I never thought research could be so "up close", i.e. with my work place as the focus of the study. Interviewing students, faculty members and colleagues was another new experience for me. Although I was involved in being a panel member in job interviews, I have never been involved in "research interviews". Therefore, I was glad to have done the pilot, so that I could do some fine-tuning before the actual interviews.

In addition, since the research was so "up close", I was an "insider" in this research. I may have some "bias" or "values" that I needed to be transparent about to the readers, and I had to be careful not to "lead" my respondents to giving answers that I wanted to hear, rather than what they really wanted to express during the

interviews. I was happy that the interviewees were supportive of my research, and even though a couple of persons I approached declined my invitation due to their work schedule, they still gave me their best wishes for my research.

Overall, becoming a researcher in the field of internationalization of higher education has been a challenging yet empowering experience. I do hope that, not only will this dissertation serve as a reflection on the "realities" of strategies' implementation at our University, but that it may also encourage fellow EdD students who are also practitioners in higher education to review the effectiveness of internationalization strategies in the context of their own institution.

References

Altbach, P. & Knight, J. (2007) "The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities", *Journal of Studies in International Education*, vol 11, no 3/4, pp 290-305.

Beelen, J. (2011) "Internationalisation at home in a global perspective: A critical survey of the 3rd Global Survey Report of IAU", in *Globalisation and Internationalisation of Higher Education*, vol 8, no 2, pp 249-264, Barcelona: UoC (RUSC), available online at http://rusc.uoc.edu/ojs/index.php/rusc/article/view/v8n2-beelen/v8n2-beelen-eng/ (Date of access: 7 February 2012).

Bell, M. (2004) "Internationalising the higher education curriculum – Do academics agree?", *Research & Development in Higher Education*, vol 27, pp 50-61.

Bogdan, R. & Biklen, S. (1998) *Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to Theory and Methods* (3rd Eds.), Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Bryman, A. (2001) *Social Research Methods*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Carr, W. (1995) "Philosophy, values and educational science", Chapter 6 from, *For Education: Towards Critical Educational Inquiry*, Buckingham: Open University Press.

Caruana, V. & Ploner, J. (2010) *Internationalisation and equality and diversity in higher education: Merging identities*, Leeds: Equality Challenge Unit, Leeds Metropolitan University.

Crowther, P., Joris, M., Otten, M., Nilsson, B., Teekens H., & Wachter, B. (2000) *Internationalisation at Home: A position paper*, Amsterdam: European Association for International Education.

Dewey, P. & Duff, S. (2009) "Reason before passion: Faculty views on internationalization in higher education", *Higher Education*, vol 58, pp 491-504.

Elkin, G., Devjee, F., & Farnsworth, J. (2005) "Visualizing the 'internationalization' of universities", *International Journal of Educational Management*, vol 19, no 4, pp 318-329.

Etherington, K. (2004) *Becoming a Reflexive Researcher: Using Our Selves in Research*, London & Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Gu, Q., Schweisfurth, M., & Day, C., (2010) "Learning and growing in a 'foreign' context: Intercultural experiences of international students", *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, vol 40, no 1, pp 7-23.

HKSAR (2005) *Panel on Education – Minutes of special meeting held on Thursday, 20 January 2005 at 11:45am in the Chamber of the Legislative Council Building*, LC Paper No. CB(2) 1630/04-05, File Reference: CB2/PL/ED.

HKSAR (2007) *Developing Hong Kong as a regional education hub*, Legislative Council Brief, File Reference: EDB CR 1/9/2041/93.

Hyland, F., Trahar, S., Anderson, J., & Dickens, A. (2008) "A changing world: The international experiences of staff and students (home and international) in UK Higher Education", *ESCalate & LLAS*, available online at http://escalate.ac.uk/4967 (Date of access: 20 December 2010).

Ippolito, K. (2007) "Promoting intercultural learning in a multicultural university: Ideals and realities", *Teaching in Higher Education*, vol 12, no 5, pp 749-763.

Jackson, E. & Huddart, T. (2010) "Curriculum design based on home students' interpretations of internationalisation", *ARECLS*, vol 7, pp 80-112.

Jiang, X. (2008) "Towards the internationalization of higher education from a critical perspective", *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, vol 32, no 4, pp 347-358.

KDU [pseudonym] (2005) *Strategic Plan 2005-2020*, Hong Kong: *KDU*.

KDU [pseudonym] (2008) *Academic Development Proposal for 2009-2012*, Hong Kong: *KDU*.

KDU [pseudonym] (2011a) *Academic Development Proposal for 2012-2015*, Hong Kong: *KDU*.

KDU [pseudonym] (2011b) *Link Newsletter (Issue 3)*, Hong Kong: *KDU*.

KDU [pseudonym] (2011c) *Strategic Plan 2011-16*, Hong Kong: *KDU*.

KDU [pseudonym] (2012a) "*KDU [pseudonym]* Makes Great Strides in Internationalization with Non-local Student Recruitment" (Press Release on 28 November 2012), *KDU website* (Date of Access: 28 February 2013).

KDU [pseudonym] (2012b) "Mission and Vision", *KDU website* (Date of Access: 28 February 2013).

KDU [pseudonym] (2012c) "Facts and Figures", *KDU website* (Date of Access: 28 February 2013).

Kell, P. & Vogl, G. (2012), "Internationalisation in the Asia Pacific: Education hubs in Hong Kong, Singapore and Malaysia", in *International Students in the Asia Pacific: Mobility, Risks and Global Optimism*, New York: Springer.

Knight, J. (2004) "Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches, and rationales", *Journal of Studies in International Education*, vol 8, no 1, pp 5-31.

Knight, J. (2011) "Education hubs: A fad, a brand, an innovation?", *Journal of Studies in International Education*, vol 15, no 3, pp 221-240.

Knight, J. & de Wit, H. (1995) "Strategies for internationalisation of higher education: historical and conceptual perspectives", in de Wit (ed.) *Strategies for Internationalisation of Higher Education*, Amsterdam: European Association for International Education.

Kvale, S. (1996) *InterViews: An Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing*, Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Lewin C. (2005) "Elementary quantitative methods", in Somekh, B. and Lewin C. (Eds), *Research Methods in the Social Sciences*, London: Sage.

Li, G., Chen, W., & Duanmu, J. L. (2010) "Determinants of international students' academic performance: A comparison between Chinese and other international students", *Journal of Studies in International Education*, vol 14, no 4, pp 389-405.

Marginson, S. (2012), "Equals or others? Mobile students in a nationally bordered world", in S. Sovic (ed.), *International Students Negotiating Higher Education: Critical Perspectives*, Kentucky: Taylor and Francis.

May, T. (2002) *Qualitative Research in Action*, London: Sage.

Mok, K. H. (2007) "Questing for internationalization of universities in Asia: Critical reflections", *Journal of Studies in International Education*, vol 11, no 3/4, pp 433-454.

Ng, S. W. (2010), "What is missing in internationalization of higher education in a time of globalization in the Asia-Pacific region?", *CGC Working Paper Series*, No. 2010/003, Hong Kong: Centre for Governance and Scholarship, HKIEd.

Ng, S. W. (2012), "The challenges of attracting Asian students to study higher education in Hong Kong", *Higher Education Quarterly*, vol 66, no 3, pp 272-292.

OECD (2012) *Education at a Glance*, Paris: OECD.

Oleksiyenko, A., Cheng, K. M., & Yip, H. K. (2012), "International student mobility in Hong Kong: Private good, public good, or trade in services?", *Studies in Higher Education*, DOI: 10.1080/03075079.2011.630726.

Postiglione, G. A. (2011) "The rise of research universities: *[KDU] [pseudonym]*" in Altbach & Samil (eds.) *The Road to Academic Excellence: The Making of World-Class Research Universities*, Washington DC: The World Bank.

Punch, K. F. (2009) *Introduction to Research Methods in Education*, London: Sage.

Quality Assurance Council (QAC) (2010) *Report of a Quality Audit of [KDU] [pseudonym]*, Hong Kong: QAC, University Grants Committee.

Rodenberg, T. C. (2010) "Measuring commitment to internationalizing the campus: An institutional fingerprint", *Journal of Applied Learning in Higher Education*, vol 2, fall 2010, pp 39-53.

Rubin, H.J. & Rubin, I.S. (2012) *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*, Thousand Oaks: Sage (3rd edition).

Sheridan, V. (2011) "A holistic approach to international students, institutional habitus and academic literacies in an Irish third level institution", *Higher Education*, vol 62, pp 129-140.

Silverman, D. (2005) *Doing Qualitative Research*, London: Sage.

Taylor, J. (2004) "Towards a strategy for internationalization: Lessons and practice from four universities", *Journal of Studies in International Education*, vol 8, pp 149-171.

Teekens, H. (ed.) (2006) *Internationalization at Home: A global perspective*, The Hague: Nuffic.

Trahar, S. (2007) "Teaching and learning: The international higher education landscape – some theories and working practices", *ESCalate Discussion Paper*, available online at http://escalate.ac.uk/3559 (Date of access: 13 December 2008).

Trahar, S. (2011) *Developing Cultural Capability in International Higher Education*, New York: Routledge.

Trahar, S., & Hyland, F. (2011) "Experiences and perceptions of internationalisation in higher education in the UK", *Higher Education Research & Development*, vol 30, no 5, pp 623-633.

Turner, Y. (2009) "'Knowing me, knowing you,' is there nothing we can do?: Pedagogic challenges in using group work to create an intercultural learning space", *Journal of Studies in International Education*, vol 13, no 2, pp 240-255.

Turner, Y. & Robson, S. (2008) *Internationalizing the University*, London: Continuum.

University Grants Committee (1993) *Higher Education 1991-2001 – An Interim Report*, Hong Kong: University Grants Committee, available online at http://www.ugc.edu.hk/eng/ugc/publication/report/interim/interim.htm (Date of Access: 1 November 2012)

University Grants Committee (2004) *Hong Kong Higher Education – To Make a Difference; to Move with the Times*, Hong Kong: University Grants Committee.

University Grants Committee (2010) *Aspirations for the Higher Education System in Hong Kong: Report of the University Grants Committee*, Hong Kong: University Grants Committee.

University Grants Committee (2012) *Online Statistics Database*, http://cdcf.ugc.edu.hk/cdcf/statIndex.do (Date of Access: 30 September 2012).

Usher, R. (1996) "A critique of the neglected epistemological assumptions of educational research", in Scott, D. and Usher, R. *Understanding Educational Research*, London: Routledge.

Welch, A.R. (2012), "Opportunistic entrepreneurialism and internationalization of higher education: Lessons from the antipodes?", *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, vol 10, no 3, pp.295-315.

Yang, R. (2002) "University internationalisation: Its meanings, rationales and implications", *International Education*, vol 13, no 1, pp 81-95.

Yang, R. (2003) "The China-Hong Kong connection: A key to internationalizing Chinese universities", *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, vol 23, no 2, pp 121-133.

Yang, R. (2005) "Internationalizing Chinese higher education: A case study of a major comprehensive university", in P. Ninnes & M. Hellsten (Eds.), *Internationalizing Higher Education – Critical Explorations of Pedagogy and Policy*, CERC Studies in Comparative Education, 16, Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Center, The University of Hong Kong

Yang, R. (2012) "Educational research in Confucian heritage cultures: Key issues", *Powerpoint presentation at the University of Bristol Hong Kong Doctoral Seminar*, held on 24 March 2012 at City University of Hong Kong.

Zha, Q. (2003) "Internationalization of higher education: Towards a conceptual framework", *Policy Futures in Education*, vol 1, no 2, pp 248-270.

Ziguras, C. & McBurnie, G. (2011), "International student mobility in the Asia-Pacific: From globalization to regional integration?", in S. Marginson et al. (Eds), *Higher Education in the Asia-Pacific*, Higher Education Dynamics, 36, New York: Springer.

(Blank page)

Appendix 1 – Template of Consent Form for Interviewees

CONFIDENTIAL
(Ref: [Interviewee's Code])

Consent Form for Interviewees

To : Jennifer Law (Email: jenlaw2000@gmail.com; Tel: 2358-8325)
University of Bristol Doctor of Education Candidate (HK Cohort 11)

I agree to participate in the interview for the purpose of data collection for your dissertation study, which is focused on the internationalization of higher education in Hong Kong and the effectiveness of internationalization strategy implementation.

By giving my consent to be interviewed, I also reserve my rights to the following:

- The analysis of data collected from the interview would only be used in the **dissertation** and any subsequent publications arising from it.

- My name and identity would **not** appear in the dissertation; I would remain anonymous and only be identified as "a [staff] in [office name]" / "a [student/faculty member] from School of [Science/Engineering/Business & Management/Humanities & Social Science]", or, I have chosen a name [_____] to represent me.

- The interview would be **tape-recorded**; after the interview, a transcript (an English transcription, or a transcription translated into English if the interview was conducted in Cantonese or Putonghua) would be sent to me by email for confirmation.

- I may choose to change and/or omit any part of my response in the interview transcript; the confirmed transcript would be returned to you **within two weeks.** If you do not hear from me within this timeframe, you may assume that I am happy with the transcript.

Confirmed and Signed by

_____
[Full name of interviewee]

Contact Email or No.: _____
Date : _____

Consent Form Received and Filed by

_____
Jennifer Law

Date : _____

(Blank Page)

Appendix 2.1 – Interview Questions (Students)

Interview Questions – Students

1. Background information of the Interviewees

1.1 How would you describe yourself ethnically? Do you consider yourself "local" to Hong Kong, as compared to the official definition of "local" students by the university (which is whether you are paying the local tuition fee)?

1.2 Where did you attend secondary school before entering *[KDU]*?

1.3 How long have you been studying at *[KDU]*?

1.4 What is your major of study?

2. Questions related to the "Research Questions" in the Study

2.1 Internationalization

2.1.1 In your own words, can you define what it means by "Internationalization of Higher Education"?

2.1.2 Have you taken courses and/or read books/journal articles related to internationalization and/or globalization before? If so, what are they?

2.1.3 Based on your own definition, do you think higher education institutions in Hong Kong, especially *[KDU]*, are "internationalized"? [If the answer is "Yes", please provide examples of why you think so.]

2.1.4 Do you recall when and where you first heard of *[KDU]*?

2.1.5 Why have you decided to attend *[KDU]* for your UG studies? To what extent do you think the level of "internationalization" of the institution would have influenced your choice?

2.2 Strategy and Implementation

2.2.1 Do you have any ideas on who are the "decision makers" at *[KDU]* for internationalization strategy, and who are the "administrators" to implement the strategy?

2.2.2 Have you ever read strategy documents published by *[KDU]* related to internationalization? If not, do you have an idea of where to locate these documents if needed?

2.2.3 Based on your knowledge of *[KDU]*'s "internationalization strategy" and your own experience as a student here, do you feel the strategy is being implemented effectively and why it is or it isn't?

3. Questions related to "personal experience" of the interviewee

3.1 Do you have many friends/classmates from *[KDU]* who are from outside HK?

3.2 [Question for local students] Can you describe your relationship/friendship with non-local students, including full-time and exchange students from outside Hong Kong? Do you interact with them in class and outside of class?

3.3 Are you "happy" about learning in an environment with more diverse students or would you prefer a learning environment with more students that have similar background as yourself? Why or why not?

3.4 Do you feel that what you learn in class is "internationalized"? Why or why not?

3.5 Do you feel that the teaching faculty is aware of the different background and learning styles of students and have they done anything to accommodate those differences?

3.6 Overall, are you "happy" about life in *[KDU]* as a student? Why or why not?

4. **Do you have any other comments/suggestions related to "internationalization" at *[KDU]*? Can you suggest fellow classmates/friends I can approach for another interview?**

Appendix 2.2 – Interview Questions (Faculty Members)

Interview Questions – Faculty Members

1. Background information of the interviewee

1.1 How would you describe yourself ethnically?
1.2 How long have you been working at *[KDU]*?
1.3 What is your work area and major roles/duties?

2. Questions related to the "Research Questions" in the Dissertation

2.1 Internationalization

2.1.1 In your own words, can you define what it means by "Internationalization of Higher Education"?

2.1.2 Based on your own definition, do you think higher education institutions in Hong Kong, especially *[KDU]*, are "internationalized"? [If the answer is "Yes", please provide examples of why you think so.]

2.1.3 What do you know, or what would you think, are the reasons for students deciding to attend *[KDU]* for their UG studies? Do you think the level of "internationalization" of the institution would have influenced their choice?

2.2 Strategy and implementation

2.2.1 Do you have any ideas on who are the "decision makers" at *[KDU]* for internationalization strategy, and who are the "administrators" to implement the strategy? Do you consider yourself as one of the "decision makers" or "administrators"? Why or why not?

2.2.2 Have you ever read strategy documents published by *[KDU]* related to internationalization? If not, do you have an idea of where to locate these documents if needed?

2.2.3 Based on your knowledge of *[KDU]*'s "internationalization strategy" and your own experience as a staff member here, do you feel the strategy is being implemented effectively and why it is or it isn't?

3 Questions related to "personal experience" of the interviewee

3.1 Do you know many students in *[KDU]* who are from outside HK?

3.2 Can you share with me your experience in teaching in an "international classroom" at *[KDU]*? What were the major problems/difficulties you faced?

3.3 Do you think students are "happy" about learning in an environment with students from more diverse background, or would they prefer a learning environment with more students that have similar backgrounds? Why or why not?

3.4 Do you feel that what students learn in class is "internationalized"? Why or why not?

3.5 Some non-local students feel that part of the course content is "very Hong Kong-ish" and some faculty members seems to speak more in the local (HK) context/colloquial and are more in favor of local students. Based on your experience, do you feel that the teaching faculty is aware of the different background and learning styles of students and have they done anything to accommodate those differences?

3.6 Overall, do you think students are "happy" about their life in *[KDU]*? Why or why not?

4 **Do you have any other comments/suggestions related to "internationalization" at *[KDU]*? Can you suggest students/colleagues I can approach for another interview?**

Appendix 2.3 – Interview Questions (Administrators)

Interview Questions – Administrators

1. **Background Information of the Interviewees**

   1.1 How would you describe yourself ethnically?

   1.2 How long have you been working at *[KDU]*?

   1.3 What is your work area and major roles/duties?

2. **Questions related to the "Research Questions" in the Study**

   2.1 Internationalization

   2.1.1 In your own words, can you define what it means by "Internationalization of Higher Education"?

   2.1.2 Based on your own definition, do you think higher education institutions in Hong Kong, especially *[KDU]*, are "internationalized"? [If the answer is "Yes", please provide examples of why you think so.]

   2.1.3 What do you know, or what would you think, are the reasons for students deciding to attend *[KDU]* for their UG studies? Do you think the level of "internationalization" of the institution would have influenced their choice?

   2.2 Strategy and Implementation

   2.2.1 Do you have any ideas on who are the "decision makers" at *[KDU]* for internationalization strategy, and who are the "administrators" to implement the strategy? Do you consider yourself as one of the "decision makers" or "administrators"? Why or why not?

   2.2.2 Have you ever read strategy documents published by *[KDU]* related to internationalization? If not, do you have an idea of where to locate these documents if needed?

   2.2.3 Do you feel whether it is an issue that *[KDU]* students are not sure where to locate the strategy documents related to internationalization and/or have not read them?

   2.2.4 Based on your knowledge of *[KDU]*'s "internationalization strategy" and your own experience as a staff member here, do you feel the strategy is being implemented effectively (and also whether the strategy is cost-effective) and why it is or it isn't?

3. **Questions related to "personal experience" of the interviewee**

   3.1 Do you know many students in *[KDU]* who are from outside HK?

   3.2 Do you think students are "happy" about learning in an environment with more diverse students or would they prefer a learning environment with more students that have similar backgrounds? Why or why not?

   3.3 Do you feel that what students learn in class is "internationalized"? Why or why not?

   3.4 Do you feel that the teaching faculty is aware of the different background and learning styles of students and have they done anything to accommodate those differences?

3.5 Overall, do you think students are "happy" about their life in *[KDU]*? Why or why not?

4. **Do you have any other comments/suggestions related to "internationalization" at *[KDU]*? Can you suggest students/colleagues I can approach for another interview?**

Appendix 3 - Interview Codes

Setting / Context Codes	*(SCC)*
SCC-1	Interviewee's ethnicity
SCC-2	Interviewee's high school *(for students only)*
SCC-3	Local student in Science
SCC-4	Local student in Engineering
SCC-5	Local student in Business
SCC-6	Non-local student in Science
SCC-7	Non-local student in Engineering
SCC-8	Non-local student in Business
SCC-9	Faculty in Science
SCC-10	Faculty in Engineering
SCC-11	Faculty in Business
SCC-12	Faculty in Social Science
SCC-13	Administrator – Student Affairs
SCC-14	Administrator – Student Recruitment
SCC-15	Administrator – Other
SCC-16	Years spent in the university
SCC-17	Roles and responsibility in the university

Definition of Situation Codes	*(DSC)*
DSC-1	Definition of internationalization
DSC-2	How the definition is formulated (books, journals, courses, media, etc.)
DSC-3	Level of internationalization at the university

Perspectives Held by Subjects Codes	*(PSC)*
PSC-1	Reason(s) for students to choose the university
PSC-2	Reason(s) for you to choose the university *(for students only)*
PSC-3	Decision to study at the university and how it relates to internationalization

Subjects' Ways of Thinking about People and Objects Codes ***(POC)***

POC-1	Relationship between local and non-local students
POC-2	Relationship between local faculty and local students
POC-3	Relationship between local faculty and non-local students
POC-4	Relationship between non-local faculty and local students
POC-5	Relationship between non-local faculty and non-local students
POC-6	Relationship between administrators and local students
POC-7	Relationship between administrators and non-local students
POC-8	Relationship between administrators and faculty
POC-9	What makes students "happy" about life in university?

Strategy Codes ***(STC)***

STC-1	Decision makers of internationalization strategy
STC-2	Administrators of internationalization strategy
STC-3	Strategy of internationalization of the university
STC-4	"Internationalization at Home" strategy
STC-5	Effectiveness of strategy implementation
STC-6	Teaching in an international classroom
STC-7	Learning in an international classroom

Appendix 4 – Sample of Coded Interview (P.175–179)

Interview Transcript (29-Feb-2012) **Ref: SSCI.STU070**

1. Background information of the Interviewees

1.1 How would you describe yourself ethnically? Do you consider yourself "local" to Hong Kong, as compared to the official definition of "local" students by the university (which is whether you are paying the local tuition fee)?

SCC-1

I am from the Shandong province of China and was born and studied in the city of Jinan in Shandong. SCC-1

1.2 Where did you attend secondary school before entering *[KDU]*?

I attended secondary school in Jinan. SCC-2

1.3 How long have you been studying at *[KDU]*?

I was here since last semester (Fall 2011). SCC-16

1.4 What is your major of study?

My major is Biochemistry. SCC-6

2. Questions related to the "Research Questions" in the Study

2.1 Internationalization

2.1.1 In your own words, can you define what it means by "Internationalization of Higher Education"?

DSC-2

Internationalization, from what I know from the Mainland, is related to branding and economic development. Currently, the learning environment in Mainland is still very China-focused, but I think the level of English comprehension of Mainland Chinese is quickly rising, as Chinese realizes the benefits of internationalization. DSC-2

In higher education, I think internationalization relates to student composition, and students from different places can exchange ideas, live together and influence each other's way of thinking. Also, we learn from faculty members from around the world, and the international concepts and ideas they share with us in class. DSC-1

2.1.2 Have you taken courses and/or read books/journal articles related to internationalization and/or globalization before? If so, what are they?

No I haven't.

2.1.3 Based on your own definition, do you think higher education institutions in Hong Kong, especially *[KDU]*, are "internationalized"? [If the answer is "Yes", please provide examples of why you think so.]

[KDU] is sure more internationalized compared to other universities in the Mainland. But I think there are still not many students from foreign countries and therefore we have limited exchange with foreign students in class. It would be better if we have more students from outside HK to study here, and also the course / curriculum design can be more internationally-focused.

2.1.4 Do you recall when and where you first heard of *[KDU]*?

In my secondary school, there were older classmates who went to Hong Kong University, so I also sent an application for admission to HKU. But in June 2011 after the JEE (Joint Entrance Examination) were finished, [KDU]'s high ranking on the QS world university rankings was mentioned on TV all the time, and I got interested in [KDU] and wanted to find out more about the university on the internet. When I searched for information on the internet, I just found out it was the last day before the application deadline for admission! So I rushed to submit an application, and luckily I got a chance to be interviewed and got admitted to [KDU].

2.1.5 Why have you decided to attend *[KDU]* for your UG studies? To what extent do you think the level of "internationalization" of the institution would have influenced your choice?

I made the decision in a very short time as I mentioned I only found out about the application deadline at the last minute. At first I wanted to have a chance to be interviewed so that I can find out what the admission interview is about for Hong Kong universities. I think studying in Hong Kong would be a new and challenging experience for me.

2.2 Strategy and Implementation

2.2.1 Do you have any ideas on who are the "decision makers" at *[KDU]* for internationalization strategy, and who are the "administrators" to implement the strategy?

I am not sure about this, but I know Prof Woon who is one of the Vice-Presidents for Development. Also, the Global Students Office has been helping international and mainland students. There's the IAS (Institute for Advanced Study) which invites faculty and scholars from outside Hong Kong for academic seminars and talks.

2.2.2 Have you ever read strategy documents published by *[KDU]* related to internationalization? If not, do you have an idea of where to locate these documents if needed?

No, I haven't paid much attention in this area. I would search the internet if I need to find out about this information.

2.2.3 Based on your knowledge of *[KDU]*'s "internationalization strategy" and your own experience as a student here, do you feel the strategy is being implemented effectively and why it is or it isn't?

I think it is effective since [KDU] attracted students from outside Hong Kong, and also it has a high quality faculty from around the world. Also, students have many choices and opportunities to attend academic seminars and talks by scholars from around the world.

3. Questions related to "personal experience" of the interviewee

3.1 Do you have many friends/classmates from *[KDU]* who are from outside HK?

I am just in Year 0, so the classes I took were all attended by students from the Mainland. I am also in the Student Union's Editorial Board, so I knew Hong Kong students from the Editorial Board. I only knew a few number of foreign students from the student hall I live and from the Redbird program I have joined.

3.2 [Question for local students] Can you describe your relationship/friendship with non-local students, including full-time and exchange students from outside Hong Kong? Do you interact with them in class and outside of class?

(Question not applicable so it was not asked)

3.3 Are you "happy" about learning in an environment with more diverse students or would you prefer a learning environment with more students that have similar background as yourself? Why or why not?

Yes I feel quite satisfied living and learning here. The course instructors whom I have met so far are very nice and they are willing to answer questions from students in detail. I think "pressure" and "motivation" can co-exist, though I am aware of how students say our university is a university of "stress and tension".

Of course students would feel more at ease using their mother tongue in learning, but I think [KDU] provides a challenging environment for learning which cannot be compared with studying in secondary school.

3.4 Do you feel that what you learn in class is "internationalized"? Why or why not?

As I said, in Year 0 (SCC-16) all students enroll in same courses, including math, language, lab science, chemistry, so I don't feel there are not much international component so far. I have also been auditing a course in social science, and I today's class I learnt about dictators in world history. I also plan to take electives such as classical music in the future, and I think these types of elective courses would contain more international content. But for the Year 0 (SCC-16) courses, apart from the fact that the medium of instruction is English, I don't think these classes are internationalized.

3.5 Do you feel that the teaching faculty is aware of the different background and learning styles of students and have they done anything to accommodate those differences?

I think, for science subjects like math or chemistry, what we learn would be similar in different universities in different places. For the electives in humanities and social science, I am looking forward to learning more international topics in the future.

The classes I am taking in Year 0 (SCC-16) have mostly mainland students, so I don't really feel that the faculty members are treating students in different ways. From the social science course I am auditing, I do see that international students raise many questions and are more active in class discussion. The local professor from a class I attended last semester used 1-2 Cantonese words during the lecture, and those who are not from Hong Kong couldn't understand those words. However, that didn't affect our understanding of the main theme of the lecture.

Mainland and Hong Kong students usually ask questions to the professor after class. If the professor is from Mainland or Hong Kong, students would use

PoC-2 *Putonghua or Cantonese to ask questions after class, and I think this may be the reason that we speak up less during class.*

For myself, the biology class uses many special terms in English which are hard to understand and I have to put in extra efforts to study these terms after class. I think the use of English has been an obstacle for us to express our thoughts and ideas in class. STC-3/5

3.6 Overall, are you "happy" about life in *[KDU]* as a student? Why or why not?

I am happy about life here, I get to see Hong Kong's different places, not just the commercial / shopping districts, but also the rural and natural scenery and I get to go on hiking on weekends. I can also join many types of activities on campus and so far it has been a challenging and fulfilling experience for me to study here. PoC-9

4. Do you have any other comments/suggestions related to "internationalization" at *[KDU]*? Can you suggest fellow classmates/friends I can approach for another interview?

I am interested to know about your studies, and to find out who are the decision makers and the strategy of internationalization here at [KDU]. STC-1 STC-3